arXiv:math/0110024v10 [math.QA] 1 Dec 2002

# DOUBLE AFFINE HECKE ALGEBRAS AND DIFFERENCE FOURIER TRANSFORMS

IVAN CHEREDNIK [†]

## Contents

1. Affine Weyl groups 12
2. Double Hecke algebras 22
3. Macdonald polynomials 30
4. Fourier transform on polynomials 39
5. Jackson integrals 48
6. Semisimple representations 57
7. Spherical representations 80
8. Gaussian and self-duality 91

References 105

We study difference Fourier transforms in the representations of double affine Hecke algebras in Laurent polynomials, polynomials multiplied by the Gaussian, and in various spaces of delta-functions, including finite-dimensional representations. The theory generalizes the Harish-Chandra theory of spherical functions, its $p$-adic variant, and harmonic analysis on Heisenberg and Weyl algebras, predecessors of the double Hecke algebras. There are applications to the Harish-Chandra inversion, Verlinde algebras, Gauss-Selberg sums, and Macdonald's $\eta$-type identities.

We discuss two major directions, compact and non compact, generalizing the corresponding parts of the classical theory of spherical functions. They are based on the imaginary and real integrations and their substitutes, namely, the constant term functional and the Jackson summation. Both directions exist in two different variants: real, as $q < 1$, and unimodular for $|q| = 1$, including roots of unity. At

---

*Date*: November 2001.

[†] Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-9877048,

roots of unity, compact and non compact directions coincide and the irreducible representations are all finite-dimensional.

It is important to extend the difference Fourier transform to arbitrary irreducible semisimple representations of double Hecke algebras. Their description is reduced in the paper to a certain combinatorial problem, which can be managed in several cases, including the case of $GL_n$ for generic $q$ as $k$, the other structural constant of the double Hecke algebra, is a special rational number.

For such algebras, semisimple and general irreducible representations are described in terms of periodic skew and generalized Young diagrams using the technique of intertwiners. The classification generalizes that due to Bernstein-Zelevinsky in the affine case and the papers [C9,C11,Na]. For generic $k$, the irreducible representations are induced from the affine Hecke algebra and the theory is not too promising. Recently Vasserot generalized the "geometric approach" from [KL1] to the double affine case. His results are for arbitrary root systems and are also the most fruitful in the case of rational $k$.

In the paper, we focus on irreducible finite-dimensional semisimple unitary (or pseudo-unitary) spherical self-dual (Fourier-invariant) representations, which are called perfect. They exist either as $q$ is a root of unity or when $q$ is generic but $k$ is special rational. Each double Hecke algebra (for an arbitrary reduced root system) may have only one such representation up to isomorphisms and the choice of the character of the affine Hecke algebra (necessary in the definition of spherical representations). It is a generalization of the uniqueness of the irreducible representations of the Weyl algebras at roots of unity. In the $A$-case, such representations are also unique among all finite-dimensional representations of the corresponding double Hecke algebra.

As $q$ is a root of unity, perfect representations lead to a new class of Gauss-Selberg sums, the eigenvalues of the Gaussian which is an eigenfunction of the difference Fourier transform. Similar sums for generic $q$ and special rational $k$ are directly related to Macdonald's $\eta$-type identities and to the classification of degenerations of the multi-dimensional Bessel and hypergeometric functions.

Arbitrary reduced root systems are considered in the paper. Modern methods are good enough to transfer smoothly the one-dimensional theory to such setting. It is worth mentioning that there are quite a few new results even in the rank one case, including new identities and new proofs of the classical formulas. It seems that the Fourier transform of the considered type was never studied systematically before [C3], even in the one-dimensional case. Its kernel, which is essentially the basic hypergeometric function, of course appeared in the integrals. However, as far as I know, the self-duality of the corresponding Fourier transform and the Fourier-invariance of the Gaussian remained unknown.

Let me also mention recent paper [St] (see also ref. therein) and the manuscript by Macdonald devoted to the so-called $C^\vee C$ case, which has all important features of the case of reduced root systems considered in this paper, including the self-duality and the existence of the Gaussians. The paper and the manuscript contain reasonably complete algebraic theory of the double affine Hecke algebra of type $C^\vee C$, nonsymmetric polynomials, and the Fourier transforms, including the prior results due to Koornwinder, Noumi, and Sahi.

Note a challenging parallelism between our cyclotomic Gaussian sums and modular Gauss-Selberg sums (see, for instance, [E]). However the difference is dramatic. In the modular case, Selberg-type kernels are calculated in finite fields and are embedded into roots of unity right before the summation. Our sums are defined entirely in cyclotomic fields.

*Nonsymmetric polynomials.* The key tool of the recent progress in the theory of orthogonal polynomials, related combinatorics, and harmonic analysis is the technique of nonsymmetric Opdam-Macdonald polynomials. The main references are [O2,M4,C4]. Opdam mentions in [O2] that a definition of the nonsymmetric polynomials (in the differential setup) was given in Heckman's unpublished lectures. These polynomials are expected to be, generally speaking, beyond quantum groups and Kac-Moody algebras because of the following metamathematical reason. Many special functions in the Lie and Kac-Moody theory, including classical and affine characters, spherical functions, conformal blocks and more are $W$-invariant. One can expect these functions to be $W$-symmetrizations of simpler and hopefully more fundamental nonsymmetric functions, but it doesn't happen in the traditional theory, with some reservation about the Demazure character formula. One needs double Hecke algebras and nonsymmetric Macdonald's polynomials to manage this problem.

However our considerations are not quite new in the representation theory. We directly generalize the harmonic analysis on Heisenberg and Weyl algebras, theory of metaplectic (Weil) representations, and borrow a lot of the affine Hecke algebra technique. The $p$-adic counterparts of the nonsymmetric polynomials are the limit of our polynomials as $q \to \infty$ and they are well known. The book [Ma] is devoted to them. See [O4] about recent developments. Let me also mention the Eisenstein integrals and series, which are nonsymmetric. The classical number theory does require nonsymmetric functions. For instance, we need all one-dimensional theta functions, not only even ones.

There are important applications of the new technique. Let me mention first [O2] and its certain continuation [C8], where the Harish-Chandra transforms of the coordinates treated as multiplication operators were calculated, which was an old open problem. This technique was successfully applied in [KnS] and further papers to the combinatorial conjectures about the coefficients of Macdonald's polynomials. The third and, I think, very convincing demonstration is the theory of nonsymmetric Verlinde algebras.

*Nonsymmetric Verlinde algebras.* Double Hecke algebras generalize Heisenberg and Weyl algebras, so it is not surprising that they are very helpful to study Fourier transforms. In a sense, perfect representations constitute all commutative algebras with "perfect" Fourier transforms, i.e. enjoying all properties of the classical one. Spherical representations appear here because they have natural structures of commutative algebras.

The subalgebras of symmetric ($W$-invariant) elements generalize the Verlinde algebras. The latter are formed by integrable representations of Kac-Moody algebras of fixed level with the celebrated fusion procedure as the multiplication. They can be also introduced as restricted categories of representations of quantum groups at roots of unity due to Kazhdan and Lusztig [KL2] and Finkelberg.

The perfect representations "triple-generalize" the Verlinde algebras, and what is important, dramatically simplify the theory. First, the Macdonald symmetric polynomials replaced the characters [Ki,C3]. Technically, the parameter $k$, which is 1 in the Verlinde theory [Ve], became an arbitrary positive integer (satisfying certain inequalities). Second and very important, the nonsymmetric polynomials replaced the symmetric ones [C4]. It is much more comfortable to deal with the Fourier transform when all functions are available, not only symmetric. It is exactly what perfect representations provide. Third, fractional $k$ appeared. Generally speaking, $hk \in \mathbf{Z}$ for the Coxeter number $h$, which is one of the results of the paper (Sections 5,8).

The final construction is rather distant from the original Verlinde algebra (and from the Lie theory). The structural constants of the multiplication are not positive integers anymore. However all other important features, including the action of $PGL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ and the positivity of the inner product, were saved. The main hermitian form considered in the paper (and previous works) extends that due to Verlinde. It makes the generators $X, T, Y$ of the double Hecke algebra unitary and sends $q \mapsto q^{-1}$. It is positive as $|q| = 1$ and the angle of $q$ is sufficiently small.

There is another important inner product which does not require the conjugation of $q$ and leads to a more traditional variant of the double Hecke harmonic analysis. It is also considered in the paper. In the standard representations in $\delta$-functions, the operators $Y$ are not normal with respect to this pairing, which diminish the role of the $Y$-semisimplicity in the theory. It is similar to the regular representation of the affine Hecke algebra, where these operators are due to Bernstein and Zelevinsky. This representation can be obtained as a limit of the $\delta$-representation as $q \to \infty$. The $X$-operators are selfadjoint with respect to this pairing and are very helpful in the double Hecke theory. However they do not survive under this limit. In the $p$-adic harmonic analysis, one needs the complete classification and advanced methods like $K$-theory [KL1]. It is what can be expected for the pairing without $q \to q^{-1}$ for the double Hecke algebras.

In the unimodular case with the pairing involving the $q$-conjugation, reasonable unitary representations are $Y$-semisimple and their eigenfunctions, for instance the nonsymmetric polynomials, play a very important role. Generally speaking, the theory becomes more elementary, and there is a hope to manage it using classical tools like the technique of the highest vectors. The paper is based on this approach. Note that in the Verlinde case, the $W$-symmetrizations of the $Y$-eigenfunctions are the restrictions of the classical characters to roots of unity.

*Macdonald-Mehta integrals.* Selberg's integrals were actually the starting point. By the way, they also gave birth to the theory of symmetric Macdonald polynomials, which appeared for the first time in Kadell's unpublished work. The history is as follows. Mehta suggested a formula for the integral of the product $\prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} (x_i - x_j)^{2k}$ with respect to the Gaussian measure. The formula was readily deduced from Selberg's integral by Bombieri. Macdonald extended Mehta's integral in [M1] to arbitrary root systems and verified his conjectures for the classical systems. He employed Selberg's integrals too. Later Opdam found a uniform proof for all root systems using the shift operators in [O1]. Note that neither alternative proofs without shift operators are known for special root systems. In [C5], $q$ was added to this theory.

The (classical) Macdonald-Mehta integral is the normalization constant for the generalized Hankel transform introduced by Dunkl [D]. The generalized Bessel functions [O3] multiplied by the Gaussian are eigenfunctions of this transform. The eigenvalues are given in terms of this constant [D,J]. It is the same in the $q$-case.

The Hankel transform is a "rational" degeneration of the Harish-Chandra spherical transform. The symmetric space $G/K$ is replaced by its tangent space $T_e(G/K)$ with the adjoint action of $G$ (see [H]). Here $G$ is a semi-simple Lie group, $K$ its maximal compact subgroup. Only very special $k$, the root multiplicities, may appear in the Harish-Chandra theory. For instance, $k = 1$ is the so-called group case. When the Harish-Chandra transform is replaced by its generalization in terms of the hypergeometric functions (see [HO1]), the parameter $k$ becomes arbitrary (and extra parameters appear).

*From Gauss integrals to Gaussian sums.* Study of the $q$-counterparts of the Hankel and Harish-Chandra transforms and the passage to the roots of unity are the goals of the paper. There are four main steps:
a) the $q$-deformation of the Macdonald-Mehta integrals,
b) the transfer from the $q$-integrals to the Jackson sums,
c) their counterparts/limits at roots of unity,
d) the product formulas for the Gauss-Selberg sums.

Let us demonstrate the complete procedure restricting ourselves with the classical one-dimensional Gauss integral.

We want to go from the celebrated formula

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} x^{2k} \mathrm{d}x \;=\; \Gamma(k+1/2),\ \Re k > -1/2, \tag{0.1}$$

to the almost equally famous Gauss formula

$$\sum_{m=0}^{2N-1} e^{\frac{\pi m^2}{2N} i} \;=\; (1+i)\sqrt{N}, \quad N \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{0.2}$$

The actual objective is to incorporate $k$ into the last formula. It seems that this natural problem was never considered in the classical works on Gaussian sums. Modular Gauss-Selberg sums give some solution, but it is not what one may expect from the viewpoint of the consistent $q$-theory.

Obviously a trigonometric counterpart of (0.1) is needed. A natural candidate is the Harish-Chandra spherical transform, where $\sinh(x)^{2k}$ substitutes for $x^{2k}$. However such choice creates problems. The Harish-Chandra transform is not self-dual anymore, the Gaussian looses its Fourier-invariance, and the formula (0.1) has no sinh-counterpart (at least for generic $k$).

a) *Difference setup.* It was demonstrated recently that these important features of the classical Fourier transform are restored for the kernel

$$(0.3)\quad \delta_k(x;q) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{j+2x})(1-q^{j-2x})}{(1-q^{j+k+2x})(1-q^{j+k-2x})},\ 0<q<1,\ k\in\mathbf{C}.$$

Actually the self-duality of the corresponding transform can be expected a priori because the Macdonald truncated theta-function $\delta$ is a unification of $\sinh(x)^{2k}$ and the Harish-Chandra function $(A_1)$ serving the inverse spherical transform.

Setting $q=\exp(-1/a),\ a>0,$

$$(0.4)\qquad (-i)\int_{-\infty i}^{\infty i} q^{-x^2}\delta_k\ \mathrm{d}x = 2\sqrt{a\pi}\prod_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{1-q^{j+k}}{1-q^{j+2k}},\quad \Re k>0.$$

The limit of (0.4) multiplied by $(a/4)^{k-1/2}$ as $a\to\infty$ is (0.1) in the imaginary variant.

b) *Jackson sums.* Special $q$-functions have many interesting properties which have no classical counterparts. The most promising feature is a possibility to replace the integrals by sums, the Jackson integrals.

Let $\int_\sharp$ be the integration for the path which begins at $z=\epsilon i+\infty$, moves to the left till $\epsilon i$, then down through the origin to $-\epsilon i$, and finally returns down the positive real axis to $-\epsilon i+\infty$ (for small $\epsilon>0$).

Then for $|\Im k|<2\epsilon, \Re k>0$,

$$\frac{1}{2i}\int_\sharp q^{x^2}\delta_k\ \mathrm{d}x\ = -\frac{a\pi}{2}\prod_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{(1-q^{j+k})(1-q^{j-k})}{(1-q^{j+2k})(1-q^{j+1})}\times\langle q^{x^2}\rangle_\sharp,$$

$$\langle q^{x^2}\rangle_\sharp \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} q^{\frac{(k-j)^2}{4}}\frac{1-q^{j+k}}{1-q^k}\prod_{l=1}^{j}\frac{1-q^{l+2k-1}}{1-q^l}$$

$$(0.5)\quad = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{j+k})}{(1-q^j)} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} q^{\frac{(k-j)^2}{4}} =$$

$$(0.6)\quad q^{\frac{k^2}{4}} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{j/2})(1-q^{j+k})(1+q^{j/2-1/4+k/2})(1+q^{j/2-1/4-k/2})}{(1-q^j)}.$$

The sum for $\langle q^{x^2}\rangle_\sharp$ is the Jackson integral for a special choice $(-k/2)$ of the starting point. Its convergence is for all $k$. The transfer (0.5) $\Rightarrow$ (0.6) holds for arbitrary root systems and, generally speaking, requires a variation of the starting point (and representations of the double Hecke algebra with highest weights). However in the one-dimensional case we can simply use the classical $\eta-$type identity.

c) *Gaussian sums.* When $q = \exp(2\pi i/N)$ and $k$ is a positive integer $\le N/2$ we come to the simplest Gauss-Selberg cyclotomic sum:

$$(0.7)\quad \sum_{j=0}^{N-2k} q^{\frac{(k-j)^2}{4}} \frac{1-q^{j+k}}{1-q^k} \prod_{l=1}^{j} \frac{1-q^{l+2k-1}}{1-q^l} = \prod_{j=1}^{k}(1-q^j)^{-1} \sum_{m=0}^{2N-1} q^{m^2/4}.$$

Its modular counterpart is (1,2b) from [E].

Formula (0.7) can be deduced directly from (0.5) following the classical limiting procedure from [Ch]. Formulas (0.4)-(0.6) can be verified by elementary methods too. However the generalizations of these formulas involving $q$-ultraspherical Rogers' polynomials do require double Hecke algebras and lead to new one-dimensional identities. Their nonsymmetric variants and multidimensional generalizations are based entirely on Hecke algebras.

There are other examples of Gaussian sums, for instance, those used in the classical quadratic reciprocity. All of them were interpreted using "the smallest" representations of the rank one double Hecke algebra in [C7]. It seems that the formulas with integers $k > 1$ did not appear in arithmetic. There are also interesting new formulas for half-integral $k$.

d) *New proof of the Gauss formula.* Substituting $k = [N/2]$ (not $k = 0$, as one may expect, which makes (0.7) a trivial identity) we get the product formula for $\sum_{m=0}^{2N-1} q^{m^2/4}$, which can be readily calculated as $q = e^{2\pi i/N}$ and quickly results in (0.2).

Let us consider the case of $N = 2k$ only (odd $N = 2k + 1$ are quite similar):

$$\sum_{m=0}^{2N-1} q^{\frac{m^2}{4}} \;=\; q^{k^2}4\,\Pi \;\text{ for }\; \Pi = \prod_{j=1}^{k}(1-q^j).$$

First, $\Pi\bar{\Pi} = (X^N - 1)(X + 1)(X - 1)^{-1}(1) = 2N$. Second, $\arg(1 - e^{i\phi}) = \phi/2 - \pi/2$ when $0 < \phi < 2\pi$, and therefore

$$\arg \Pi = \frac{\pi}{N}k(k+1)2 - \pi k2 = \frac{\pi(1-k)}{4}.$$

Here we can switch to arbitrary primitive $q = \exp(2\pi i l/N)$ as $(l, N) = 1$. It is necessary to control somehow the set of $\arg(q^j)$ for $1 \le j \le k$. This leads to the quadratic reciprocity (see [CO]). We do not discuss this direction in this paper.

Finally,

$$\arg(q^{\frac{k^2}{4}}\Pi) = \pi(1-k)4 + \frac{\pi k}{4} = \pi 4, \quad \text{and} \quad q^{\frac{k^2}{4}}\Pi = \sqrt{N}(1+i).$$

*Macdonald's $\eta$-identities.* The approach via double Hecke algebras provides interesting deformations of (some) cyclotomic Gauss-Selberg sums and the corresponding unitary self-dual representations. Surprisingly, the roots of unity can be replaced by arbitrary $q$ such that $|q| = 1$. The numbers of terms in the sums and respectively the dimensions of the representations remain the same. The Fourier transform and all other related structures and formulas can be deformed as well. For instance, as $k = 1$ we deform the Verlinde algebras together with the hermitian forms and the projective $PGL_2(\mathbf{Z})$-action.

The deformation is as follows. We start with finite-dimensional irreducible spherical representations of double affine Hecke algebras where $q$ is generic and $k$ is special negative rational. Such representations are studied in the paper in detail (note that an example was considered in [DS]). They remain irreducible as $q$ becomes a root of unity under certain conditions. Since positive and negative $k$ cannot be distinguished at roots of unity, it gives the desired deformation.

The representation theory of double Hecke algebras at such special negative $k$ is directly connected with the Macdonald identities [M6]. They are product formulas for the Gauss-type sums over the root lattices upon the shift by $-(1/h)\rho$, where $\rho$ is the half-sum of all positive roots, $h$ the Coxeter number. The Macdonald identities correspond exactly to one-dimensional representations of the double Hecke algebra. Replacing $-(1/h)$ by $-(m/h)\rho$ for integral $m > 0$ relatively prime to $h$, we come to multidimensional representations.

*Relations to the classical theories.* There are two variants of difference Fourier transforms based on the pairing a) involving or b) not involving the formal conjugation $q \mapsto q^{-1}$, $t \mapsto t^{-1}$. Case b) is new. The previous papers [M4,C4] and others devoted to the nonsymmetric polynomials were based on the pairing of type a). This conjugation is quite natural as $|q| = 1$, but creates certain problems in the real theory. In the paper, we remove the conjugation, for instance, calculate the scalar products of the nonsymmetric polynomials without it. The final theory is actually very close to that from [O2]. See also [HO1]. In a way, we replace $w_0$ in Opdam's paper by $T_{w_0}$.

To be more exact, the conjugation $q \to q^{-1}$ in the main scalar product is not a problem and can be eliminated when $W$-invariant functions are considered. However it plays an important role in the nonsymmetric setup.

This development clarifies completely the relations to the Harish-Chandra theory of spherical functions and the $p$-adic theory due to Macdonald, Matsumoto and others. In papers [O4,O5], Opdam developed the Matsumoto theory of "nonsymmetric" spherical functions towards the theory of nonsymmetric polynomials. The operator $T_{w_0}$ appears there in the inverse transform in a way similar to that of the present paper ([O4], Proposition 1.12). The $p$-adic theory corresponds to the limit $q \to \infty$, with $t$ being $p$ or its proper power (in the rigorous $p$-adic setup). Technically, the case $q = \infty$ is much simpler than the $q, t$-case, however quite a few features of the general case can be seen under such degeneration. Note that the self-duality of the Fourier transform and the Gaussian do not survive in this limit. See the end of [CO].

It is worse mentioning that in the theory of double affine Hecke algebras the Fourier transform has a topological interpretation as the transposition of the periods of the elliptic curve via the elliptic braid group. See [CO] and also [Bi].

As $q \to 1$, $t = q^k$, we come to [O2] and, via the symmetrization, to the Harish-Chandra theory (with $k$ being the root multiplicity). Algebraically, this limiting case is similar to the general theory, however the analytic problems are quite different. The nonsymmetric Fourier transform in the space of compactly supported $C^\infty$-functions is analyzed in [O2] in detail. Analytically, the $q, t$-case seems closer to the $p$-adic theory and to the theory of generalized Hankel transform. We do not discuss the analytic problems in this paper. There are some results in this direction in [C5] (mainly the construction of the general spherical functions), [C10] (analytic continuations in terms of $k$ with applications to $q$-counterparts of Riemann's zeta function), [KS] and in other papers by Koelink and Stokman. The latter papers are devoted to explicit analytic properties of the one-dimensional Fourier transforms in terms of the basic hypergeometric function, closely connected with those considered in [C3,C5].

*Plan of the paper.* Let us describe the structure of the paper. The first three sections mainly contain the results from the previous papers, adjusted and extended to include a) the scalar products without the conjugation $q \mapsto q^{-1}$, b) the roots of unity. There are also some new combinatorial results about affine Weyl groups necessary for the classification technique from the next sections, which is essentially the technique of intertwining operators.

Sections 4,5 are about general theory of the Fourier transforms in the compact and non compact cases. They act on polynomials with and without multiplication by the Gaussian and in spaces of delta-functions (called the functional representations). The application to the $\eta$-identities concludes Section 5.

In Section 6, we find necessary and sufficient conditions for a representation with the cyclic vector to be semisimple and pseudo-unitary, including a special consideration of the case of $GL_n$. It is the main tool for the next Sections 7,8 devoted to the classification of spherical and self-dual representations. We consider there main examples of finite-dimensional prefect representations, which provide generalizations of the Macdonald $\eta$-identities and the Verlinde algebras.

The exposition is self-contained. The one-dimensional papers [CM], [C7], and [CO] combined with the second part of [C6] could be a reasonable introduction. The papers [C5] (Macdonald-Mehta integrals, general $q$-spherical functions) and [C1] (induced and spherical representations) also contain additional results and examples.

*Acknowledgments.* The author thanks V. Kac and I. Macdonald for useful comments, P. Etingof and E. Vasserot for discussing the case

of $GL_n$, and acknowledges his indebtedness to E. Opdam for reading the paper and making important helpful suggestions which especially influenced Introduction and Section 7. Significant part of the paper was written while delivering a course of lectures on double Hecke algebras at Harvard University (spring 2001). I am grateful to D. Kazhdan, P. Etingof, and V. Ostrik, who made the course possible, participated in it, and stimulated the paper a great deal. I also would like to thank R. Rentschler for the kind invitation (summer 2001), and IHES for hospitality (summer 2002).

## 1. Affine Weyl groups

Let $R = \{\alpha\} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be a root system of type $A, B, ..., F, G$ with respect to a euclidean form $(z, z')$ on $\mathbf{R}^n \ni z, z'$, $W$ the Weyl group generated by the reflections $s_\alpha$, $R_+$ the set of positive roots ($R_- = -R_+$), corresponding to (fixed) simple roots roots $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, $\Gamma$ the Dynkin diagram with $\{\alpha_i, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ as the vertices, $R^\vee = \{\alpha^\vee = 2\alpha/(\alpha,\alpha)\}$ the dual root system,

$$Q = \oplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}\alpha_i \subset P = \oplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}\omega_i,$$

where $\{\omega_i\}$ are fundamental weights: $(\omega_i, \alpha_j^\vee) = \delta_{ij}$ for the simple coroots $\alpha_i^\vee$.

Replacing $\mathbf{Z}$ by $\mathbf{Z}_\pm = \{m \in \mathbf{Z}, \pm m \geq 0\}$ we get $Q_\pm, P_\pm$. Note that $Q \cap P_+ \subset Q_+$. Moreover, each $\omega_j$ has all nonzero coefficients (sometimes rational) when expressed in terms of $\{\alpha_i\}$. Here and further see [B].

The form will be normalized by the condition $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$ for the short roots. This normalization coincides with that from the tables in [B] for $A, C, D, E, G$. Hence $\nu_\alpha \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} (\alpha,\alpha)/2$ can be either $1, 2$ or $1, 3$ and $Q \subset Q^\vee, P \subset P^\vee$, where $P^\vee$ is generated by the fundamental coweights $\omega_i^\vee$. Sometimes we write $\nu_{\text{sht}}$ for short roots (it is always 1) and $\nu_{\text{lng}}$ for long ones.

Let $\vartheta \in R^\vee$ be the maximal positive coroot. All simple coroots appear in its decomposition. See [B] to check that $\vartheta$ considered as a root (it belongs to $R$ because of the choice of normalization) is maximal among all short positive roots of $R$. For the sake of completeness, let us prove another defining property of $\vartheta$ (see Proposition 1.6 below for a uniform proof).

**Proposition 1.1.** *The least nonzero element in* $Q_+^+ = Q_+ \cap P_+ = Q \cap P_+$ *with respect to* $Q_+$ *is* $\vartheta$, *i.e.* $b - \vartheta \in Q_+$ *for all* $b \in Q_+^+$.

*Proof.* If $a \in Q_+^+$ then all coefficients of the decomposition of $a$ in terms of $\alpha_i$ are nonzero. Indeed, if $\alpha_i$ does not appear in this decomposition then its neighbors (in the Dynkin diagram) have negative scalar products with $a$. This readily gives the claim when $\vartheta = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$, i.e. for the systems $A, B$. In these cases, $\vartheta$ is $\omega_1 + \omega_n$ for $A$ and $\omega_1$ for $B$. Otherwise, it is $\omega_2$ $(C, D, E_6)$, $\omega_1$ $(E_7)$, $\omega_8$ $(E_8)$, $\omega_4$ $(F_4)$, and $\omega_1$ $(G_2)$ respectively (in the notation from [B]). The corresponding subscripts of $\omega$ will be denoted by $\tilde{o}$. They are the indices of the simple roots neighboring the root $-\vartheta$ added to the Dynkin diagram $\Gamma$.

The proposition holds for $E_8, F_4, G_2$, because in these cases $P = Q$ and $\omega_j - \omega_{\tilde{o}} \in Q_+$ (use the tables from [B]). So we need to examine $C, D, E_{6,7}$.

As to $C$, one verifies that $\omega_j - \omega_2 \in (1/2)Q_+$ for $j \geq 2$ and $Q_+^+$ is generated by $\omega_{2i}$ and $\omega_{2i+1} + \omega_{2j+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq [n/2]$. Thus the relation $2\omega_1 - \omega_2 \in Q_+$ proves the claim. In the $D$-case, $a - \omega_2$ for $a \in Q_+^+$ can be apart from $(1/4)Q_+$ only if it is a linear combination of $\omega_1, \omega_{n-1}$, and $\omega_n$. However such a combination either "contains" $\omega_{n-1} + \omega_n$ or $2\omega_1$, which is sufficient to make it greater than $\omega_2$ (with respect to $Q_+$).

For $R = E_6$, $\omega_j - \omega_2 \in (1/3)Q_+$ when $j \geq 2 = \tilde{o}$ except for $j = 6$. The intersection of $Q$ and $\mathbf{Z}_+\omega_1 + \mathbf{Z}_+\omega_6$ is generated by $3\omega_1$, $3\omega_6$, $\omega_1 + \omega_6$. Either weight is greater than $\omega_2$. In the case of $E_7$, $\tilde{o} = 1$, $\omega_j - \omega_1 \in (1/2)Q_+$ if $j \leq 6$, and $2\omega_7$ is greater than $\omega_1$. $\square$

Setting $\nu_i = \nu_{\alpha_i}$, $\nu_R = \{\nu_\alpha, \alpha \in R\}$, one has

$$\rho_\nu \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} (1/2) \sum_{\nu_\alpha = \nu} \alpha = \sum_{\nu_i = \nu} \omega_i, \text{ where } \alpha \in R_+,\ \nu \in \nu_R. \tag{1.1}$$

*Affine roots.* The vectors $\tilde{\alpha} = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j] \in \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R} \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ for $\alpha \in R, j \in \mathbf{Z}$ form the *affine root system* $\tilde{R} \supset R$ ( $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$ are identified with $[z, 0]$). We add $\alpha_0 \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} [-\vartheta, 1]$ to the simple roots for the maximal short root $\vartheta$. The corresponding set $\tilde{R}$ of positive roots coincides with $R_+ \cup \{[\alpha, \nu_\alpha j],\ \alpha \in R,\ j > 0\}$.

We complete the Dynkin diagram $\Gamma$ of $R$ by $\alpha_0$ (by $-\vartheta$ to be more exact). The notation is $\tilde{\Gamma}$. One can get it from the completed Dynkin diagram for $R^\vee$ [B] reversing all the arrows.

The set of the indices of the images of $\alpha_0$ by all the automorphisms of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ will be denoted by $O$ ($O = \{0\}$ for $E_8, F_4, G_2$). Let

$O' = r \in O, r \neq 0$. The elements $\omega_r$ for $r \in O'$ are the so-called minuscule weights: $(\omega_r, \alpha^\vee) \leq 1$ for $\alpha \in R_+$.

Given $\tilde\alpha = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j] \in \tilde R$, $b \in B$, let

$$(1.2) \qquad s_{\tilde\alpha}(\tilde z) \ = \ \tilde z - (z, \alpha^\vee)\tilde\alpha, \quad b'(\tilde z) \ = \ [z, \zeta - (z, b)]$$

for $\tilde z = [z, \zeta] \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$.

The *affine Weyl group* $\tilde W$ is generated by all $s_{\tilde\alpha}$ (we write $\tilde W =< s_{\tilde\alpha}, \tilde\alpha \in \tilde R_+ >$). One can take the simple reflections $s_i = s_{\alpha_i}$ $(0 \leq i \leq n)$ as its generators and introduce the corresponding notion of the length. This group is the semidirect product $W \ltimes Q'$ of its subgroups $W =< s_\alpha, \alpha \in R_+ >$ and $Q' = \{a', a \in Q\}$, where

$$(1.3) \qquad \alpha' = \ s_\alpha s_{[\alpha, \nu_\alpha]} = \ s_{[-\alpha, \nu_\alpha]} s_\alpha \ \text{ for } \ \alpha \in R.$$

The *extended Weyl group* $\hat W$ generated by $W$ and $P'$ (instead of $Q'$) is isomorphic to $W \ltimes P'$:

$$(1.4) \qquad (wb')([z, \zeta]) \ = \ [w(z), \zeta - (z, b)] \ \text{ for } \ w \in W, b \in B.$$

Later in this paper, $b$ and $b'$ will be identified.

Given $b \in P_+$, let $w_0^b$ be the longest element in the subgroup $W_0^b \subset W$ of the elements preserving $b$. This subgroup is generated by simple reflections. We set

$$(1.5) \qquad u_b = w_0 w_0^b \in W, \ \pi_b = b(u_b)^{-1} \ \in \ \hat W, \ u_i = u_{\omega_i}, \pi_i = \pi_{\omega_i},$$

where $w_0$ is the longest element in $W$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

The elements $\pi_r \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \pi_{\omega_r}, r \in O'$ and $\pi_0 = \mathrm{id}$ leave $\tilde\Gamma$ invariant and form a group denoted by $\Pi$, which is isomorphic to $P/Q$ by the natural projection $\{\omega_r \mapsto \pi_r\}$. As to $\{u_r\}$, they preserve the set $\{-\vartheta, \alpha_i, i > 0\}$. The relations $\pi_r(\alpha_0) = \alpha_r = (u_r)^{-1}(-\vartheta)$ distinguish the indices $r \in O'$. Moreover (see e.g. [C2]):

$$(1.6) \ \ \hat W = \Pi \ltimes \tilde W, \ \ \text{where } \ \pi_r s_i \pi_r^{-1} = s_j \ \text{ if } \ \pi_r(\alpha_i) = \alpha_j, \ 0 \leq j \leq n.$$

*The length on* $\hat W$. Setting $\hat w = \pi \tilde w \in \hat W$, $\pi \in \Pi, \tilde w \in \tilde W$, the length $l(\hat w)$ is by definition the length of the reduced decomposition $\tilde w = s_{i_l} \ldots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$ in terms of the simple reflections $s_i, 0 \leq i \leq n$. The number of $s_i$ in this decomposition such that $\nu_i = \nu$ is denoted by $l_\nu(\hat w)$.

The length can be also introduced as the cardinality $|\lambda(\hat w)|$ of

$$\lambda(\hat w) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \tilde R_+ \cap \hat w^{-1}(\tilde R_-), \ \hat w \in \hat W.$$

This set is a disjoint union of $\lambda_\nu(\hat w)$ :

$$\lambda_\nu(\hat w) \ = \ \{\tilde\alpha\in\lambda(\hat w), \nu(\tilde\alpha)=\nu\} \ = \ \{\tilde\alpha,\ l_\nu(\hat w s_{\tilde\alpha}) < l_\nu(\hat w)\}. \tag{1.7}$$

The coincidence with the previous definition is based on the equivalence of the relation $l_\nu(\hat w\hat u) = l_\nu(\hat w)+l_\nu(\hat u)$ for $\hat w,\hat u\in\hat W$ and

$$\lambda_\nu(\hat w\hat u) = \lambda_\nu(\hat u)\cup \hat u^{-1}(\lambda_\nu(\hat w)), \tag{1.8}$$

which, in its turn, is equivalent to the positivity condition $\hat u^{-1}(\lambda_\nu(\hat w))\subset \tilde R_+$.

Formula (1.8) includes obviously the positivity condition. It also implies that

$$\lambda_\nu(\hat u)\cap \hat u^{-1}(\lambda_\nu(\hat w)) \ = \ \hat u^{-1}\big(\hat u(\lambda_\nu(\hat u))\cap\lambda_\nu(\hat w)\big) \ = \ \emptyset,$$

thanks to the formula

$$\lambda_\nu(\hat w^{-1}) = -\hat w(\lambda_\nu(\hat w)).$$

Thus it results in the equality $l_\nu(\hat w\hat u) = l_\nu(\hat w)+l_\nu(\hat u)$.

The other equivalences are based on the following simple general fact:

$$\lambda_\nu(\hat w\hat u)\setminus\{\lambda_\nu(\hat w\hat u)\cap\lambda_\nu(\hat u)\} = \hat u^{-1}(\lambda_\nu(\hat w))\cap\tilde R_+ \text{ for any } \hat u,\hat w. \tag{1.9}$$

For instance, the condition for the lengths readily implies (1.8). For the sake of completeness, let us deduce (1.9) from the positivity condition above. We follow [C2].

It suffices to check that $\lambda_\nu(\hat w\hat u)\supset\lambda_\nu(\hat u)$. If there exists a positive $\tilde\alpha\in\lambda_\nu(\hat u)$ such that $(\hat w\hat u)(\tilde\alpha)\in\tilde R_+$, then

$$\hat w(-\hat u(\tilde\alpha))\in\tilde R_- \ \Rightarrow\ -\hat u(\tilde\alpha)\in\lambda_\nu(\hat w)\ \Rightarrow\ -\tilde\alpha\in\hat u^{-1}(\lambda_\nu(\hat w)).$$

We come to a contradiction with the positivity.

Applying (1.8) to the reduced decomposition above,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\hat w) =&\{\tilde\alpha^1=\alpha_{i_1},\ \tilde\alpha^2 = s_{i_1}(\alpha_{i_2}),\ \tilde\alpha^3 = s_{i_1}s_{i_2}(\alpha_{i_3}),\ldots\\ &\ldots,\tilde\alpha^l = \tilde w^{-1}s_{i_l}(\alpha_{i_l})\}.\end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

The cardinality $l$ of the set $\lambda(\hat w)$ equals $l(\hat w)$.

This set can be introduced for nonreduced decompositions as well. Let us denote it by $\tilde\lambda(\hat w)$ to differ from $\lambda(\hat w)$. It always contains $\lambda(\hat w)$ and, moreover, can be represented in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde\lambda(\hat w) \ &= \ \lambda(\hat w)\cup\tilde\lambda^+(\hat w)\cup -\tilde\lambda^+(\hat w),\\ \text{where }\ \tilde\lambda^+(\hat w) \ &= \ (\tilde R_+\cap\ \tilde\lambda(\hat w))\setminus\lambda(\hat w).\end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

The coincidence with $\lambda(\hat{w})$ is for reduced decompositions only.

**Reduction modulo $W$.** The following proposition is from [C4]. It generalizes the construction of the elements $\pi_b$ for $b \in P_+$.

**Proposition 1.2.** *Given $b \in P$, there exists a unique decomposition $b = \pi_b u_b$, $u_b \in W$ satisfying one of the following equivalent conditions:*

*i) $l(\pi_b) + l(u_b) \;=\; l(b)$ and $l(u_b)$ is the greatest possible,*

*ii) $\lambda(\pi_b) \cap R \;=\; \emptyset$.*

*The latter condition implies that $l(\pi_b) + l(w) \;=\; l(\pi_b w)$ for any $w \in W$. Besides, the relation $u_b(b) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} b_- \in P_- = -P_+$, holds, which, in its turn, determines $u_b$ uniquely if one of the following equivalent conditions is imposed:*

*iii) $l(u_b)$ is the smallest possible,*

*iv) if $\alpha \in \lambda(u_b)$ then $(\alpha, b) \neq 0$.*

$\square$

Since $\pi_b = b u_b^{-1} = u_b^{-1} b_-$, the set $\pi_P = \{\pi_b, b \in P\}$ can be described in terms of $P_-$:

$$\pi_P = \{u^{-1} b_- \text{ for } b_- \in P_-,\ u \in W$$

$$\text{such that } \alpha \in \lambda(u^{-1}) \Rightarrow (\alpha, b_-) \neq 0\}. \tag{1.12}$$

Using the longest element $w_0'$ in the centralizer $W_0'$ of $b_-$, such $u$ constitute the set

$$\{u, \mid l(u^{-1} w_0') \;=\; l(w_0') + l(u^{-1})\}.$$

Their number is $|W|/|W_0'|$.

For $\tilde{\alpha} = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j] \in \tilde{R}_+$, one has:

$$\lambda(b) = \{\tilde{\alpha},\ (b, \alpha^\vee) > j \geq 0 \text{ if } \alpha \in R_+,$$
$$(b, \alpha^\vee) \geq j > 0 \text{ if } \alpha \in R_-\}, \tag{1.13}$$

$$\lambda(\pi_b) = \{\tilde{\alpha},\ \alpha \in R_-,\ (b_-, \alpha^\vee) > j > 0 \text{ if } u_b^{-1}(\alpha) \in R_+,$$
$$(b_-, \alpha^\vee) \geq j > 0 \text{ if } u_b^{-1}(\alpha) \in R_-\}, \tag{1.14}$$

$$\lambda(\pi_b^{-1}) = \{\tilde{\alpha},\ -(b, \alpha^\vee) > j \geq 0\}. \tag{1.15}$$

$$\lambda(u_b) = \{\alpha \in R_+,\ (b, \alpha^\vee) > 0\}. \tag{1.16}$$

Let us introduce the following *affine action* of $\hat{W}$ on $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$:

$$(wb)((z)) \;=\; w(b + z),\ w \in W, b \in P,$$

$$s_{\tilde{\alpha}}((z)) \;=\; z - ((z, \alpha) + j)\alpha^\vee,\ \tilde{\alpha} = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j] \in \tilde{R}. \tag{1.17}$$

For instance, $(bw)(\!(0)\!) = b$ for any $w \in W$. The relation to the above action is given in terms of the *affine pairing* $([z,l], z'+d) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} (z,z')+l$ :

$$(\hat{w}([z,l]), \hat{w}(\!(z')\!)+d) \ = \ ([z,l], z'+d) \ \text{ for } \ \hat{w} \in \hat{W}, \tag{1.18}$$

where we treat $d$ formally.

Introducing the *affine Weyl chamber*

$$\mathfrak{C}_a \ = \ \bigcap_{i=0}^{n} \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_i}, \ \mathfrak{L}_{[\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]} = \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n, \ (z,\alpha)+j > 0\},$$

we come to another interpretation of the $\lambda$-sets:

$$\lambda_\nu(\hat{w}) \ = \ \{\tilde{\alpha} \in R_+^a, \ \mathfrak{C}_a \not\subset \hat{w}(\!(\mathfrak{L}_{\tilde{\alpha}})\!), \ \nu_\alpha = \nu\}. \tag{1.19}$$

For instance, $\Pi$ is the group of all elements of $\hat{W}$ preserving $\mathfrak{C}_a$ with respect to the affine action. Geometrically, the elements $\pi_b$ are exactly those sending the negative $-\mathfrak{C}_a$ of $\mathfrak{C}_a$ to the negative $-\mathfrak{C}$ of the nonaffine Weyl chamber $\mathfrak{C} \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n, (z,\alpha_i) > 0 \text{ as } i > 0\}$. More generally, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.3.** *Given two finite sets of positive affine roots* $\{\tilde{\beta} = [\beta, \nu_\beta i]\}$ *and* $\{\tilde{\gamma} = [\gamma, \nu_\gamma j]\}$, *let* $L_{\beta,\gamma}$ *be the closure of the union of* $\hat{w}(\!(-\mathfrak{C}_a)\!)$ *over* $\hat{w} \in \hat{W}$ *such that* $\tilde{\beta} \notin \lambda(\hat{w}) \ni \tilde{\gamma}$. *Then*

$$L_{\beta,\gamma} = \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n, \ (z,\beta)+i \le 0, \ (z,\gamma)+j \ge 0 \ \text{ for all } \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}\}.$$

*The same holds in the nonaffine variant for* $\mathfrak{C}$ *in place of* $\mathfrak{C}_a$.

□

We will later need the following "affine" variant of Proposition 1.2. Given $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$, there exists a unique element $\tilde{w} = u_z a_z$ with $a_z \in Q$ and $u_z \in W$ satisfying the relations

$$\begin{aligned} &z_- \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \tilde{w}(\!(z)\!) \in -\bar{\mathfrak{C}_a}, \\ &(z_-, \vartheta) = -1 \ \Rightarrow \ u_z^{-1}(\vartheta) \in R_-, \ \text{ and} \\ &(\alpha_i, z_-) = 0 \ \Rightarrow \ u_z^{-1}(\alpha_i) \in R_+, \ i > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.20}$$

where $-\bar{\mathfrak{C}_a}$ is the negative of the closure $\bar{\mathfrak{C}_a}$ of $\mathfrak{C}_a$.

The element $b_- = u_b(b)$ is a unique element from $P_-$ which belongs to the orbit $W(b)$. So the equality $c_- = b_-$ means that $b, c$ belong to the same orbit. We will also use $b_+ \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} w_0(b_+)$, a unique element in $W(b) \cap P_+$. In terms of $\pi_b$,

$$u_b\pi_b \;=\; b_-,\ \pi_b u_b \;=\; b_+.$$

Note that $l(\pi_b w) = l(\pi_b) + l(w)$ for all $b \in P,\ w \in W$. For instance,

$$\begin{aligned} &l(b_- w) = l(b_-) + l(w),\ l(w b_+) = l(b_+) + l(w),\\ &l(u_b\pi_b w) = l(u_b) + l(\pi_b) + l(w) \ \text{ for } \ b \in P,\ w \in W. \end{aligned} \tag{1.21}$$

We will use these relations together with the following proposition when calculating the conjugations of the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials.

**Proposition 1.4.** *The set $\lambda(\hat{w})$ for $\hat{w} = wb$ consists of $\tilde{\alpha} = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j]$ with positive $\alpha$ if and only if*

$$(b, \alpha^\vee) \geq -1 \quad \textit{and} \quad (b, \alpha^\vee) = -1 \Rightarrow \alpha \in \lambda(w) \tag{1.22}$$

*for all $\alpha \in R_+,\ b \in P$. The elements $\hat{w} \in W \cdot P_+$ are of this type.*

*Proof.* We use (1.11):

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(wb) \;&=\; \lambda(b) \cup ({}^{-b}\lambda(w)) \setminus (\tilde{\lambda}^+ \cup -\tilde{\lambda}^+),\\ \text{where } \ \tilde{\lambda}^+ \;&=\; \tilde{R}_- \cap ({}^{-b}\lambda(w)). \end{aligned} \tag{1.23}$$

The latter set is

$$\{[\alpha, \nu_\alpha(b, \alpha^\vee)]\} \text{ such that } (b, \alpha^\vee) < 0,\ \alpha \in \lambda(w).$$

Let us calculate $\lambda(wb) \cap \lambda(b)$. We need to remove from $\lambda(b)$ the roots

$$-[\alpha, \nu_\alpha(b, \alpha^\vee)] \ \text{ for } \ \alpha > 0 \text{ such that } (b, \alpha^\vee) < 0,\ \alpha \in \lambda(w).$$

The roots in the form $[-\alpha, \nu_\alpha j]$ belong to $\lambda(b)$ exactly for $0 < j \leq -(b, \alpha^\vee)$. Therefore $\lambda(wb) \cap \lambda(b) =$

$$\begin{aligned} =\ \{\ &[\alpha, \nu_\alpha j],\ 0 \leq j < (b, \alpha^\vee) \text{ as } (b, \alpha^\vee) > 0,\\ &[-\alpha, \nu_\alpha j],\ 0 < j < -(b, \alpha^\vee) \text{ as } (b, \alpha^\vee) < 0 \text{ and } \alpha \in \lambda(w),\\ &[-\alpha, \nu_\alpha j],\ 0 < j \leq -(b, \alpha^\vee) \text{ as } (b, \alpha^\vee) < 0 \text{ and } \alpha \notin \lambda(w)\ \}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.24}$$

for $\alpha \in R_+$.

Now let us assume that nonaffine components of the roots from $\lambda(wb)$ are all positive. Then $(b, \alpha^\vee) \geq -1$ for all $\alpha > 0$ and $\lambda(w)$ contains all $\alpha$ making $-1$ in the the scalar product with $b$ above. These conditions are also sufficient. $\square$

*Partial ordering on P.* It will be necessary in the theory of nonsymmetric polynomials. See [O2,M4]. This ordering was also used in [C2] in the process of calculating the coefficients of $Y$-operators:

$$b \le c, c \ge b \text{ for } b, c \in P \text{ if } c - b \in A_+, \tag{1.25}$$

$$b \preceq c, c \succeq b \text{ if } b_- < c_- \text{ or } \{b_- = c_- \text{ and } b \le c\}. \tag{1.26}$$

Recall that $b_- = c_-$ means that $b, c$ belong to the same $W$-orbit. We write $<, >, \prec, \succ$ respectively if $b \neq c$.

The following sets

$$\sigma(b) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{c \in P, c \succeq b\},\ \sigma_*(b) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{c \in P, c \succ b\},$$

$$\sigma_-(b) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sigma(b_-),\ \sigma_+(b) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sigma_*(b_+) = \{c \in P, c_- > b_-\}. \tag{1.27}$$

are convex. By *convex*, we mean that if $c, d = c + r\alpha \in \sigma$ for $\alpha \in R_+, r \in \mathbf{Z}_+$, then

$$\{c,\ c+\alpha, ..., c+(r-1)\alpha,\ d\} \subset \sigma. \tag{1.28}$$

The convexity of the intersections $\sigma(b) \cap W(b), \sigma_*(b) \cap W(b)$ is by construction. For the sake of completeness, let us check the convexity of the sets $\sigma_\pm(b)$.

Both sets are $W$-invariant. Indeed, $c_- > b_-$ if and only if $b_+ > w(c) > b_-$ for all $w \in W$. The set $\sigma_-(b)$ is the union of $\sigma_+$ and the orbit $W(b)$. Here we use that $b_+$ and $b_-$ are the greatest and the least elements of $W(b)$ with respect to "$>$". This is known (and can be readily checked by the induction with respect to the length - see e.g. [C2]).

If the endpoints of (1.28) are between $b_+$ and $b_-$ then it is true for the orbits of all inner points even if $w \in W$ changes the sign of $\alpha$ (and the order of the endpoints). Also the elements from $\sigma(b)$ strictly between $c$ and $d$ (i.e. $c + q\alpha,\ 0 < q < r$) belong to $\sigma_+(b)$. This gives the required.

The next two propositions are essentially from [C1].

**Proposition 1.5.** *i) Let $c = \hat{u}(\!(0)\!)$, where $\hat{u}$ is obtained by striking out any number of $\{s_j\}$ from a reduced decomposition of $\pi_b (b \in P)$. Then $c \succ b$. Generally speaking, the converse is not true even if $c \in W(b)$ (I. Macdonald). In other words, the Bruhat order of $\hat{W}$ when restricted to $\{\pi_b, b \in P\}$ is stronger than $\succ$ .*

*ii) Letting $b = s_i(\!(c)\!)$ for $0 \le i \le n$, the element $s_i\pi_c$ can be represented in the form $\pi_b$ for some $b \in P$ if and only if $(\alpha_j, c + d) \neq 0$.*

*More exactly, the following three conditions are equivalent:*

$$(1.29)\quad \{c \succ b\} \Leftrightarrow \{(\alpha_i^\vee, c+d) > 0\} \Leftrightarrow \{s_i\pi_c = \pi_b,\ l(\pi_b) = l(\pi_c)+1\}.$$

$\square$

**Proposition 1.6.** *i) Assuming (1.29), let $i>0$. Then $b = s_i(c)$, $b_- = c_-$, and $u_b = u_c s_i$. The set $\lambda(\pi_b)$ is obtained from $\lambda(\pi_c)$ by replacing the strict inequality $(c_-, \alpha^\vee) > j > 0$ for $\alpha = u_c(\alpha_i)$ (see (1.15)) with $(c_-, \alpha^\vee) \ge j > 0$. Here $\alpha \in R_-$, and $(c_-, \alpha^\vee) = (c, \alpha_i^\vee) > 0$.*

*ii) In the case $i=0$, the following holds: $b = \vartheta + s_\vartheta(c)$, the element $c$ is from $\sigma_+(b)$, $b_- = c_- - u_c(\vartheta) \in P_-$, and $u_b = u_c s_\vartheta$. For $\alpha = u_c(-\vartheta) = \alpha^\vee$, the $\lambda$-inequality $(c_-, \alpha^\vee) \ge j > 0$ is replaced with the strict inequality $(c_-, \alpha^\vee) + 2 > j > 0$. Here $\alpha \in R_-$, and $(c_-, \alpha^\vee) = -(c, \vartheta) \ge 0$.*

*iii) For any $c \in P, r \in O'$, $\pi_r\pi_c = \pi_b$ where $b = \pi_r(\!(c)\!)$. Respectively, $u_b = u_c u_r$, $b = \omega_r + u_r^{-1}(c)$, $b_- = c_- + u_c w_0(\omega_r)$. In particular, the latter weight always belongs to $P_-$.*

*Proof.* Let us check i). First, $\pi_b = s_i\pi_c = s_i c u_c^{-1} = s_i(c)(u_c s_i)^{-1}$. The uniqueness of the latter decomposition gives the coincidence $u_b = u_c s_i$. Second, $\lambda(\pi_b)$ is the union of $\lambda(\pi_c)$ and $(u_c c^{-1})(\alpha_i) = [\alpha, (c, \alpha_i)]$ for $\alpha = u_c(\alpha_i) \in R_-$ (see (1.8)). Third, the inequality with $\alpha^\vee$ in (1.15) is strict for $c$ because $u_c^{-1}(\alpha) = \alpha_i \in R_+$ and becomes non-strict for $b$ since $u_b^{-1}(\alpha) = -\alpha_i \in R_-$.

For ii), it is the other way round. Namely, the extra affine root from $\lambda(\pi_b) \setminus \lambda(\pi_c)$ is $\pi_c^{-1}(\alpha_0) = [u_c(-\vartheta), 1-(c,\vartheta)]$. Therefore $\alpha = u_c(-\vartheta) \in R_-$ and the $\lambda$-inequality for $\pi_c$ is non-strict. As for $\pi_b$, $u_b^{-1}(\alpha) = (u_c s_\vartheta)^{-1}(\alpha) = \vartheta \in R_+$, and the inequality becomes strict. Explicitly, $(b_-, \alpha) = (b, -\vartheta) = (s_\vartheta(c-\vartheta), -\vartheta) = 2 - (c, \vartheta)$. $\square$

*Arrows in $P$.* We write $c \to b$ or $b \leftarrow c$ in the cases i),ii) from the proposition above and use the left-right arrow $c \leftrightarrow b$ for iii) or when $b$ and $c$ coincide. By $c \twoheadrightarrow b$, we mean that $b$ can be obtained from $c$ by a chain of (simple) right arrows. Respectively, $c \leftrightarrow\!\!\!\rightarrow b$ indicates that $\leftrightarrow$ can be used in the chain. Actually no more than one left-right arrow is always sufficient and it can be placed right after $c$. If such arrows are not involved then the ordering is obviously stronger than the Bruhat order given by the procedure from i), Proposition 1.5, which in its turn is stronger than "$\succ$".

If $l(\pi_b) = l(\pi_c) + l(\pi_b\pi_c^{-1})$ then the reduced decomposition of $\hat{w} = \pi_b\pi_c^{-1}$ readily produces a chain of simple arrows from $c$ to $b$. The number of right arrows is precisely $l(\hat{w})$ (see(1.29)). Only transforms of type ii),iii) will change the $W$-orbits, adding negative short roots to the corresponding $c_-$ for ii) and the weights in the form $w(\omega_r)$ $(w \in W)$ for iii).

For instance, let $c, b, b-c \in P_-$. Then $\pi_c = c,\ \pi_b = b,\ \hat{w} = b - c$ is of length $l(b) - l(c)$, and we need to decompose $b - c$. If $c = 0,$ then $b - \omega_r \in Q$, the reduced decomposition of $b$ begins with $\pi_r$ $(r \in O')$, and the first new $c_-$ is $w_0(\omega_r)$. When there is no $\pi_r$ and $b \in Q \cap P_-$, the chain always starts with $-\vartheta$. Note that it gives another proof of Proposition 1.1.

Let us now examine the arrows $c \Rightarrow b$ from the viewpoint of the $W$-orbits. The following proposition is useful for the classification and description of the perfect representation (the end of the paper).

**Proposition 1.7.** *i) Given $c_- \in P_-$, any element in the form $c_- + u(\vartheta) \in P_-$ for $u \in W$ such that $u(\vartheta) \in R_-$ can be represented as $b_-$ for proper $c$ such that $W(c_-) \ni c \to b$. Respectively, $c_- + u(\omega_r) \in P_-$ can be represented as $b_-$ for proper $c \leftrightarrow b$.*

*ii) In the case of $A, D, E$, any element $b_-$ such that $b_- \prec c_-$ (both belong to $P_-$) can be obtained from $c_- \in P_-$ using consecutive arrows $W(c_-) \ni c \to b \in W(b_-)$. This cannot be true for all root systems because only short roots may be added to $c_-$ using such a construction.*

*Proof.* Let $c' = c_- + u(\omega_r) \in P_-$. Given $a = u(\omega_r)$, one can assume that $u$ is the greatest possible, i.e. $u(\beta) \in R_-$ if $\beta \in R_+$ and $(\beta^\vee, \omega_r) = 0$. Explicitly, $u = u_a^{-1} w_0$. We use the inequalities $(c', \alpha) \le 0$ $(\alpha \in R_+)$ for $\alpha$ such that $(\alpha, c_-) = 0$ (if such $\alpha$ exist). This gives that $(c', \alpha) = (\omega_r, u^{-1}(\alpha))$ is either 0 or negative (actually only $-1$ may appear). In the latter case, $u^{-1}(\alpha)$ contains $\alpha_r$ with a negative coefficient, and therefore $u^{-1}(\alpha) \in R_-$. If the scalar product is zero then $u^{-1}(\alpha)$ is negative too because of the maximality of $u$. Thus $w_0 u^{-1}$ leaves such $\alpha$ in $R_+$ and can be represented as $u_c^{-1}$ for proper $c \in W(c_-)$ (see Proposition 1.2 and (1.12)).

If $c' = c_- + u(\vartheta) \in P_-$, we use the same reasoning: $(\vartheta, u^{-1}(\alpha)) < 0$ implies that $u^{-1}(\alpha)$ is negative. So $u$ can be represented as $u_c w_0$ and $c' = c_- - u_c(\vartheta)$ for proper $c$. Then we observe that $(c_-, u_c(\vartheta)) = (c, \vartheta) \le 0$ because $u(\vartheta)$ was assumed to be negative.

It is worth mentioning that the direct statement (that $c' \in P_-$ for $u$ from Proposition 1.6) also holds and can be readily checked. One needs to use that the weights $\{\omega_r\}$ are minuscule and $(\vartheta,\alpha^\vee)\ge 2$ $(\alpha\in R)$, with the equality exactly for $\alpha=\vartheta$ $(\alpha\in R)$.

Now let us assume that $c,b\in P_-$ and $0\neq x=b-c\in Q_-$ in the simply-laced case $A,D,E$. We pick a a connected component $I_t$ of $I=\{i\mid (x,\alpha_i)\le 0\}$ in the Dynkin diagram $\Gamma$ and set $x_t=\sum_{i\in I_t} l_i\alpha_i$ for $x=\sum_{i=1}^n l_i\alpha_i$. Then $(x_t,\alpha_i)\le 0$ for $i\in I_t$, since $(\alpha_i,\alpha_j)<0$ as $i\in I_t\not\ni j$. Obviously, $x_t\ge x$.

Let $\vartheta_t$ be the maximal short root for the root subsystem $R_t\subset R$ generated by $\{\alpha_i, i\in I_t\}$ as simple roots, Then $-\vartheta_t\ge x_t$ thanks to Proposition 1.1. Moreover, $(\vartheta_t,\alpha_j)\ge -1$ for $j\notin I_t$. Here we use that the coefficient of $\alpha_i$ in $\vartheta_c$ is 1 if $\alpha_i$ is an end point of $I_t$ and at the same time an inner point in $\Gamma$. This can be readily checked using the tables of [B]. Note that one may not assume that $\alpha_i$ is inner in $\Gamma$ if $I_t$ is of type $A,D$.

Here the value $-1$ is reached precisely for the neighbors of the end-points of $I_t$ in $\Gamma\setminus I_t$ (otherwise the scalar product is zero). Such points $\alpha_j$ do not belong to $I$ because $I_t$ is a connected component of $I$. Therefore $(c,\alpha_j)<0$ since $(x,\alpha_j)>0$ and $(b+x,\alpha_j)\le 0$. We see that $c>c'=c-\vartheta_t\ge b$ (all three weights are from $P_-$) and can continue by induction. $\square$

## 2. Double Hecke algebras

We keep the notations from the previous section. For the sake of uniformity, let

$$([b,l],[b',l'])=(b,b'),\ [\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]^\vee=[\alpha^\vee,j],\ X_0=X_{\alpha_0}=q_\vartheta X_\vartheta^{-1}.$$

By $m$, we denote the least natural number such that $(P,P)=(1/m)\mathbf{Z}$. So $m=2$ for $D_{2k}$, $m=1$ for $B_{2k},C_k$, otherwise $m=|\Pi|$.

The definition of double affine Hecke algebra will depend on the parameters $q,\{t_\nu,\nu\in\nu_R\}$. The basic field will be $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=}\mathbf{Q}[q^{\pm 1/(2m)},t^{\pm 1/2}]$ formed by polynomials in terms of $q^{\pm 1/(2m)}$ and $\{t_\nu^{\pm 1/2}\}$. If $q,t$ are regarded to be complex numbers (e.g. when $q$ is a root of unity) then the fractional powers of $q,t$ have to be somehow fixed. We set

$$\begin{aligned}&t_{\tilde\alpha}=t_\alpha=t_{\nu_\alpha},\ t_i=t_{\alpha_i},\ q_{\tilde\alpha}=q^{\nu_\alpha},\ q_i=q^{\nu_{\alpha_i}},\\ &\text{where }\ \tilde\alpha=[\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\tilde R,\ 0\le i\le n.\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

To simplify formulas we will use the parameters $\{k_\nu\}$ together with $\{t_\nu\}$ setting

$$t_\alpha = t_\nu = q_\alpha^{k_\nu} \ \text{ for } \ \nu = \nu_\alpha \ \text{ and } \ \rho_k = \sum_\nu k_\nu \rho_\nu.$$

For instance, by $q^{(\rho_k,\alpha)}$ we mean $\prod_{\nu\in\nu_R} t_\nu^{(\rho_\nu,\alpha^\vee)}$. Here $\alpha \in R$ and therefore it is a product of integral powers of $t_{\text{sht}}$ and $t_{\text{lng}}$.

Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be pairwise commutative and algebraically independent. We set

$$X_{\tilde b} \ = \ \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{l_i} q^j \ \text{ if } \ \tilde b = [b, j], \tag{2.2}$$

$$\text{where } b = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i\omega_i \in P, \ j \in \frac{1}{m}\mathbf{Z}.$$

The elements $\hat w \in \hat W$ act in the ring $\mathbf{Q}[q^{\pm 1/m}][X]$ of polynomials in terms of $X_b (b \in P)$ and $q^{\pm 1/m}$ by the formulas:

$$\hat w(X_{\tilde b}) \ = \ X_{\hat w(\tilde b)}. \tag{2.3}$$

In particular,

$$\pi_r(X_b) \ = \ X_{u_r^{-1}(b)} q^{(\omega_{r^*}, b)} \ \text{ for } \ \alpha_{r^*} \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \pi_r^{-1}(\alpha_0), \ r \in O'. \tag{2.4}$$

Note that the involution $r \mapsto r^*$ of the set $O'$ satisfies the relations $u_r u_{r^*} = 1 = \pi_r \pi_{r^*}$. Moreover, $w_0(\omega_r) = -\omega_{r^*}$ for the longest element $w_0 \in W$. Thus $\alpha_r \mapsto \alpha_{r^*}$ is nothing else but the automorphism of the nonaffine Dynkin diagram (preserving $\alpha_0$). This can be readily seen from the tables of [B], where only the case of $D_n$ requires some consideration.

Recall the notation $(d, [\alpha, j]) = j$. For instance, $(\alpha_0^\vee, b+d) = 1-(b, \vartheta)$.

**Definition 2.1.** *The double affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}$ (see [C2]) is generated over the field $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$ by the elements $\{T_i, \ 0 \le i \le n\}$, pairwise commutative $\{X_b, \ b \in P\}$ satisfying (2.2), and the group* $\Pi$, *where the following relations are imposed:*

*(o)* $(T_i - t_i^{1/2})(T_i + t_i^{-1/2}) \ = \ 0, \ 0 \ \le \ i \ \le \ n;$

*(i)* $T_iT_jT_i... \ = \ T_jT_iT_j...,$ *$m_{ij}$ factors on each side;*

*(ii)* $\pi_r T_i \pi_r^{-1} \ = \ T_j$ *if* $\pi_r(\alpha_i) = \alpha_j;$

*(iii)* $T_iX_bT_i \ = \ X_bX_{\alpha_i}^{-1}$ *if* $(b+d, \alpha_i^\vee) = 1, \ 0 \le i \le n;$

*(iv)* $T_iX_b \ = \ X_bT_i$ *if* $(b+d, \alpha_i^\vee) = 0$ *for* $0 \le i \le n;$

*(v)* $\pi_r X_b \pi_r^{-1} \;=\; X_{\pi_r(b)} \;=\; X_{u_r^{-1}(b)} q^{(\omega_{r^*}, b)},\; r \in O'.$

$\square$

Given $\tilde{w} \in W^a, r \in O,$ the product

$$T_{\pi_r \tilde{w}} \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \pi_r \prod_{k=1}^{l} T_{i_k}, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{w} = \prod_{k=1}^{l} s_{i_k}, l = l(\tilde{w}), \tag{2.5}$$

does not depend on the choice of the reduced decomposition (because $\{T\}$ satisfy the same "braid" relations as $\{s\}$ do). Moreover,

$$T_{\hat{v}} T_{\hat{w}} \;=\; T_{\hat{v}\hat{w}} \quad \text{whenever } l(\hat{v}\hat{w}) = l(\hat{v}) + l(\hat{w}) \ \text{ for } \ \hat{v}, \hat{w} \in \hat{W}. \tag{2.6}$$

In particular, we arrive at the pairwise commutative elements

$$Y_b \;=\; \prod_{i=1}^{n} Y_i^{k_i} \ \text{ if } \ b = \sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i \omega_i \in P, \quad \text{where} \ \ Y_i \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} T_{\omega_i}, \tag{2.7}$$

satisfying the relations

$$\begin{aligned} T_i^{-1} Y_b T_i^{-1} \;&=\; Y_b Y_{a_i}^{-1} \ \text{ if } \ (b, \alpha_i^\vee) = 1, \\ T_i Y_b \;&=\; Y_b T_i \ \text{ if } \ (b, \alpha_i^\vee) = 0,\; 1 \le i \le n. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

**Automorphisms.** The following maps can be uniquely extended to automorphisms of $\mathcal{H}\!\!\!\mathcal{H}$ (see [C1,C4]):

$$\varepsilon : X_i \mapsto Y_i, \quad Y_i \mapsto X_i, \quad T_i \mapsto T_i^{-1},\; t_\nu \mapsto t_\nu^{-1}, q \mapsto q^{-1}, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\tau_+ :\; X_b \mapsto X_b,\; Y_r \mapsto X_r Y_r q^{-(\omega_r,\omega_r)/2},\; T_i \mapsto T_i,\; t_\nu \mapsto t_\nu,\; q \mapsto q,$$

$$\tau_+ : Y_0 \mapsto Y_0 T_0^2 X_0 = q^{-1} T_{s_\vartheta}^{-1} T_0 X_0, \quad Y_0 = Y_{\alpha_0} \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} q_\vartheta^{-1} Y_\vartheta^{-1}, \tag{2.10}$$

where $1 \le i \le n,\ r \in O'$. The formulas for the images of $\{Y_r, Y_0\}$ readily give:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(T_0) \ &= (Y_0 T_0 X_0)^{-1} \;=\; X_\vartheta T_{s_\vartheta},\; \tau_+(T_0) \;=\; X_0^{-1} T_0^{-1}, \\ \varepsilon(\pi_r) \ &= X_r T_{u_r^{-1}},\; \tau_+(\pi_r) \;=\; q^{-(\omega_r,\omega_r)/2} X_r \pi_r = q^{(\omega_r,\omega_r)/2} \pi_r X_{r^*}^{-1}, \\ &\text{for } \ \pi_r X_{r^*} \pi_r^{-1} \;=\; q^{(\omega_r,\omega_r)} X_r^{-1},\; X_{r^*} T_{u_r} X_r \;=\; T_{u_{r^*}}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Theorem 2.3 from [C4] states that the mapping

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \varepsilon,\; \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \tau_+ \tag{2.12}$$

can be extended to a homomorphism of $GL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ to the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{H}\!\!\!\mathcal{H}$ modulo conjugations by the central elements from the group generated by $T_1, \ldots, T_n$. In this statement, the quadratic relation (o) from Definition 2.1 may be omitted. Only group relations matter.

We will also need the following automorphisms of $\mathcal{HH}$ :

$$\tau_- \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \varepsilon\tau_+\varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \tau_+\tau_-^{-1}\tau_+ = \tau_-^{-1}\tau_+\tau_-^{-1} = \varepsilon\sigma^{-1}\varepsilon. \tag{2.13}$$

They preserve $T_1, \ldots, T_n,\ t, q$ and are uniquely defined from the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} &\tau_- : Y_b \mapsto Y_b,\ X_r \mapsto Y_r X_r q^{\frac{(\omega_r,\omega_r)}{2}},\\ &\tau_- : X_0 \mapsto (T_0X_0Y_0T_0)^{-1} = qT_{s_\vartheta}X_0^{-1}T_0^{-1},\\ &\sigma : X_b \mapsto Y_b^{-1},\ Y_r \mapsto Y_r^{-1}X_rY_rq^{-(\omega_r,\omega_r)},\ Y_0 \mapsto T_{s_\vartheta}^{-1}X_0^{-1}T_{s_\vartheta}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where $b \in P,\ r \in O'$. Besides,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tau_-(T_0) \ = \ T_0,\ \tau_-(\pi_r) \ = \ \pi_r \ (r \in O'),\\ &\sigma(T_0) = T_{s_\vartheta}^{-1}X_\vartheta^{-1},\ \sigma(\pi_r) = Y_r^{-1}X_r\pi_rq^{-(\omega_r,\omega_r)} = T_{u_r}^{-1}X_{r^*}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Thus $\tau_-$ corresponds to $\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ 1 & 1\end{pmatrix}$, $\sigma$ to $\begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\\ -1 & 0\end{pmatrix}$.

The relation $\tau_+\tau_-^{-1}\tau_+ = \tau_-^{-1}\tau_+\tau_-^{-1}$ is exactly the definition of the projective $PSL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ due to Steinberg. It formally gives that $\sigma^2$ commutes with $\tau_\pm$. Generally speaking, $\sigma^2$ is not inner in $\mathcal{HH}$ . It is the conjugation by $T_{w_0}^{-1}$ if $w_0 = -1$. See below. Always, $\sigma^4$ is the conjugation by $T_{w_0}^{-2}$, which is central in the nonaffine Hecke algebra $\langle T_i,\ 1 \le i \le n\rangle$.

All automorphisms introduced above are unitary. An automorphism $\omega$ of $\mathcal{HH}$ is called *unitary* if $\star\,\omega\,\star = \omega^{-1}$ for the main anti-involution $\star$ from [C2]:

$$\begin{aligned} &X_i^\star \ = \ X_i^{-1},\ \ Y_i^\star \ = \ Y_i^{-1},\ \ T_i^\star \ = \ T_i^{-1},\\ &t_\nu \mapsto t_\nu^{-1},\ q \mapsto q^{-1},\ 0 \le i \le n,\ (AB)^\star = B^\star A^\star. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

The commutativity with $\star$ is obvious because it is the inversion with respect to the multiplicative structure of $\mathcal{HH}$ .

The following automorphism of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ will play an important role in the paper: $\eta \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \varepsilon\sigma$. It is uniquely defined from the relations

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta : T_i \mapsto T_i^{-1},\ X_b \mapsto X_b^{-1},\ \pi_r \mapsto \pi_r,\\ &\quad\text{where }\ 0 \le i \le n,\ b \in P,\ r \in O'. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

It conjugates $q, t$, and extends the Kazhdan-Lusztig involution on the affine Hecke algebra generated by $\{T_i,\ i \ge 0\}$.

Here we have used (2.14) to calculate the images of $X, T_i$ $(i > 0)$. Applying (2.15):

$$\varepsilon\sigma(T_0) = \varepsilon(T_{s_\vartheta}^{-1} X_0) = T_{s_\vartheta} Y_0 = T_0^{-1},\ \varepsilon\sigma(\pi_r) = \\ \varepsilon(T_{u_r}^{-1} X_{r^*}^{-1}) = T_{u_r^{-1}} Y_{r^*}^{-1} = T_{u_{r^*}} Y_{r^*}^{-1} = \pi_{r^*}^{-1} = \pi_r.$$

We remind the reader that $\pi_{r^*} = \pi_r^{-1}$ and $u_{r^*} = u_r^{-1}$, where $r \in O$, $\alpha_{r^*} = \pi_r^{-1}(\alpha_0)$. The map $r \mapsto r^*$ corresponds to the automorphism of the nonaffine Dynkin diagram. It is straightforward to check that

$$\eta(Y_r) = T_{w_0} Y_{r^*}^{-1} T_{w_0}^{-1} \ \text{ for } \ r \in O'.$$

We are going to generalize it to arbitrary $Y_b$.

We will use the same symbol $\varsigma$ for two different maps, namely, for the following one:

$$\begin{aligned} &b \mapsto b^\varsigma \ = \ -w_0(b),\ b \in P, \ \ s_i \mapsto s_{\varsigma(i)}, \ \text{ where} \\ &\varsigma(\alpha_i) = \alpha_{\varsigma(i)} = -w_0(\alpha_i) \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le n,\ \varsigma(0) = 0,\ \varsigma(\alpha_0) = \alpha_0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

which is extended naturally to $\hat{W}$, and for the corresponding automorphism of $\mathcal{HH}$ :

$$\varsigma:\ X_b \mapsto X_{\varsigma(b)},\ Y_b \mapsto Y_{\varsigma(b)},\ T_i \mapsto T_{\varsigma(i)},\ \pi_r \mapsto \pi_{r^*}. \tag{2.19}$$

The one from (2.19) commutes with all previous automorphisms.

**Proposition 2.2.**

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(Y_b) \ &= \ T_{w_0} Y_{w_0(b)} T_{w_0}^{-1},\ \sigma(Y_b) = T_{w_0}^{-1} X_{w_0(b)} T_{w_0}, \\ &\sigma^2(X_b) = T_{w_0}^{-1} X_{w_0(b)}^{-1} T_{w_0},\ \sigma^2(Y_b) = T_{w_0}^{-1} Y_{w_0(b)}^{-1} T_{w_0}, \\ &\sigma^2(T_0) = T_{w_0}^{-1} T_0 T_{w_0},\ T_{w_0}^{-1} Y_\vartheta T_{w_0} = T_{s_\vartheta}^{-1} Y_\vartheta T_{s_\vartheta}, \\ &T_{\varsigma(i)} = T_{w_0}^{-1} T_i T_{w_0} \ \textit{ for } \ i > 0,\ T_{w_0}^{-1} T_{s_\vartheta} T_{w_0} = T_{s_\vartheta}, \\ &\sigma^2(H) = T_{w_0}^{-1} \varsigma(H) T_{w_0},\ \sigma^4(H) = T_{w_0}^{-2} H T_{w_0}^2 \ \textit{ for } \ H \in \mathcal{HH}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

*Proof.* The formulas for $\sigma$ easily follow from those for $\eta$, so it suffices to check that $\eta(Y_b) = T_{-b}^{-1}$ for $b \in P_+$ coincides with

$$T_{w_0} Y_{w_0(b)} T_{w_0}^{-1} = T_{w_0} Y_{\varsigma(b)}^{-1} T_{w_0}^{-1} = T_{w_0} T_{\varsigma(b)}^{-1} T_{w_0}^{-1},$$

i.e. we need the relation $T_{-b} = T_{w_0} T_{\varsigma(b)} T_{w_0}^{-1}$.

Since $-b \in P_-$ , $T_{-b}T_{w_0} = T_{(-b)\cdot w_0}$. Here we apply (1.21). Similarly, $\varsigma(b) \in P_+$ and

$$T_{w_0}T_{\varsigma(b)} \ = \ T_{w_0\cdot(\varsigma(b))}.$$

However $w_0 \cdot (\varsigma(b)) = w_0 \cdot w_0 \cdot (-b) \cdot w_0 = (-b) \cdot w_0$. □

**Demazure-Lusztig operators.** Following [L, KK, C2],

$$\hat{T}_i \ = \ t_i^{1/2}s_i \ + \ (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2})(X_{\alpha_i} - 1)^{-1}(s_i - 1),\ 0 \le i \le n, \tag{2.21}$$

preserve $\mathbf{Q}[q, t^{\pm 1/2}][X]$. We note that only $T_0$ involves $q$:

$$\hat{T}_0 \ = t_0^{1/2}s_0 \ + \ (t_0^{1/2} - t_0^{-1/2})(qX_\vartheta^{-1} - 1)^{-1}(s_0 - 1),$$

$$\text{where } \ s_0(X_i) \ = \ X_iX_\vartheta^{-(\omega_i,\theta)}q^{(\omega_i,\vartheta)},\ \alpha_0 = [-\vartheta, 1]. \tag{2.22}$$

**Theorem 2.1.** *i) The map* $T_j \mapsto \hat{T}_j,\ X_b \mapsto X_b$ *(see (2.2)),* $\pi_r \mapsto \pi_r$ *(see (2.4)) induces a* $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$*-linear homomorphism from* $\mathcal{H}$ *to the algebra of linear endomorphisms of* $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]$*. This representation, which will be called polynomial, is faithful and remains faithful when* $q, t$ *take any nonzero complex values assuming that* $q$ *is not a root of unity.*

*ii) For arbitrary nonzero* $q, t$ *any element* $H \in \mathcal{H}$ *have a unique decomposition in the form*

$$H = \sum_{w \in W} g_wT_wf_w,\ g_w \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X],\ f_w \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[Y] \tag{2.23}$$

*and five more analogous decompositions corresponding to the other orders of* $\{T, X, Y\}$*.*

*iii) The image* $\hat{H}$ *of* $H \in \mathcal{H}$ *is uniquely determined from the following condition:*

$$\hat{H}(f(X)) \ = \ g(X) \ \text{ for } \ H \in \mathcal{H}\ , \ \ \text{if } \ Hf(X) - g(X) \ \in$$

$$\{\sum_{i=0}^{n} H_i(T_i - t_i^{1/2}) + \sum_{r \in O'} H_r(\pi_r - 1), \ \ \text{where } \ H_i, H_r \in \mathcal{H}\ \}. \tag{2.24}$$

*The automorphism* $\tau_-$ *preserves (2.24) and therefore acts in the polynomial representation.*

*Proof.* This theorem is essentially from [C2] and [C3]. One only needs to extend ii) to roots of unity (it was not formulated in [C2] in the complete generality). In the first place, the existence of such a decomposition is true for all $q$, which follows directly from the defining relations. Secondly, the uniqueness holds for generic $q$ because the polynomial representation is faithful (a similar argument was used in [C2]). Finally, the number of linearly independent expressions in the form (2.23) (when the degrees of $f, g$ are bounded) may not become smaller for special $q$ than for generic $q$ (here by special we mean the roots of unity). $\square$

We will also use the above statements for the *intermediate subalgebras* of $\mathcal{H}$ with $P$ replaced by its subgroups containing $Q$. Let $B$ be any lattice between $Q$ and $P$, respectively, $\Pi^\flat$ the preimage of $B/Q$ in $\Pi$, and $\hat{W}^\flat = \Pi^\flat \cdot \tilde{W} = B \cdot W$. By $\mathcal{H}^\flat$ , we denote the subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}$ generated by $X_b (b \in B), \pi \in \Pi^\flat$ and $T_i (0 \le i \le n)$. Thus $Y_b \in \mathcal{H}^\flat$ when $b \in B$. Actually the lattices for $X_b$ and $Y_b$ can be different, but when discussing the Fourier transforms it is convenient to impose the coincidence. Here $m$ can be replaced by $\tilde{m}$ such that $\tilde{m}(B,B) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ in the definition of $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$.

**Proposition 2.3.** *The algebra $\mathcal{H}^\flat$ satisfies all claims of Theorem 2.1 for $B$ instead of $P$ and the polynomial representations in $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b, b \in B]$. The automorphisms $\varepsilon, \tau_\pm, \sigma, \eta$ and the anti-involution $\star$ preserve this subalgebra.*

*Proof.* The compatibility of the definition of $\mathcal{H}^\flat$ with the automorphisms $\tau_\pm$ follows directly from the formulas for their action on $X_r, Y_r (r \in O')$ and $T_0$ (see (2.11, 2.14)). Since $\mathcal{H}^\flat$ is generated by $X_b, Y_b (b \in \tilde{B})$ and $\{T_1, ..., T_n\}$ this holds for $\varepsilon$ as well. Claim i) from Theorem 2.1 remains true for the polynomials in $X_b (b \in B)$ because the formulas for $\hat{T}_i$ involve $X_\alpha$ only.

To check ii) we need a more complete version of the relations (iii,iv) from Definition 2.1 (cf. [L] and formula (2.21) above). Namely, for all $b \in P$,

$$(2.25) \qquad T_i X_b - X_{s_i(b)} T_i \ = \ (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2}) \frac{s_i(X_b) - X_b}{X_{\alpha_i} - 1}, \ 0 \le i \le n.$$

This relation and its dual counterpart for $Y$ instead of $X$ ensure the existence of the decompositions (2.23). Using the fact that the polynomial representation is faithful (for generic $q$) we establish the uniqueness (for all $q \neq 0$). Claim iii) formally results from ii). $\square$

The following Proposition is essentially from [C4] (Proposition 3.3). In the notation from (1.27), we set

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(b) &\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \oplus_{c\in\sigma(b)}\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}x_c\ ,\Sigma_*(b) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \oplus_{c\in\sigma_*(b)}\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}x_c \\ \Sigma_-(b) &= \Sigma(b_-),\ \Sigma_+(b) \ =\ \Sigma_*(b_+),\ b\in B.\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Let us denote the maps $b\mapsto -b$ by $\imath$. Recall that $b\mapsto -w_0(b)$ is denoted by $\varsigma$. Respectively,

$$\imath : X_b\mapsto X_{-b}=X_b^{-1},\ \varsigma : X_b\mapsto X_b^{\varsigma}=\varsigma(X_b)=X_{-w_0(b)}.$$

Then $\varsigma$ preserves the ordering and sends $\Sigma(b)$ and $\Sigma_*(b)$ to $\Sigma(\varsigma(b))$ and $\Sigma_*(\varsigma(b))$.

**Proposition 2.4.** *i)Given $b\in B$, $\tilde\alpha=[\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\tilde R$ with $\alpha>0$, the operator*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tilde\alpha}\ =\ t_\alpha^{1/2}+\ (t_\alpha^{1/2}-t_\alpha^{-1/2})(X_{\tilde\alpha}^{-1}-1)^{-1}(1-s_{\tilde\alpha}) \tag{2.27}$$

*preserves $\Sigma(b),\Sigma_*(b),\Sigma_\pm(b)$. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_{\tilde\alpha}(X_b)\,mod\,\Sigma_+(b) &= t_\alpha^{1/2}X_b+\ (t_\alpha^{1/2}-t_\alpha^{-1/2})s_{\tilde\alpha}(X_b)\quad \mathit{if}\ \ (b,\alpha)<0,\\ &= t_\alpha^{-1/2}X_b\quad \mathit{if}\ \ (b,\alpha)>0,\\ &= t_\alpha^{1/2}X_b\quad \mathit{if}\ \ (b,\alpha)=0.\end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

*ii)The operators $\hat w^{-1}T_{\hat w}$ preserve $\Sigma(b),\Sigma_*(b)$, and $\Sigma_\pm(b)$ if all $\tilde\alpha=[\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\lambda(\hat w)$ have positive $\alpha$. The elements $\hat w\in W\cdot B_+$ have this property. For instance, $Y_c$ leave the $\Sigma$-sets invariant for all $c\in B$ and*

$$\imath\cdot T_{w_0}:\Sigma(b)\to\Sigma(\varsigma(b)),\ \Sigma_*(b)\to\Sigma_*(\varsigma(b)).$$

*iii) Assuming ii),*

$$\begin{aligned}\hat w^{-1}T_{\hat w}(X_b)\,mod\,\Sigma_*(b)\ &=\ \prod_{(\tilde\alpha,b)\le 0}t_\alpha^{1/2}\prod_{(\tilde\alpha,b)>0}t_\alpha^{-1/2}\,X_b\\ &\mathit{multiplied\ over}\ \tilde\alpha=[\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\lambda(\hat w).\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

*In particular,*

$$\begin{aligned}Y_c(X_b)\,mod\,\Sigma_*(b)\ &=\ q^{(c,u_b^{-1}(\rho_k)-b)}\,X_b, \\ \imath\cdot T_{w_0}(X_b)\,mod\,\Sigma_*(b) &= \prod_{\nu\in\nu_R}t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2-l_\nu(u_b)}\,X_{\varsigma(b)}\,mod\,\Sigma_*(\varsigma(b)).\end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

□

The operators $\{T_j, 0\le j\le n\}$ may not fix the spaces $\Sigma(b),\Sigma_*(b)$. However they leave $\Sigma_-(b)$ and $\Sigma_+(b)$ invariant. Hence the *affine Hecke algebra* $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ generated by $T_i(0\le i\le n)$ and the group $\Pi^\flat$ act in the space

$$V(b) \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \Sigma_-(b)/\Sigma_+(b) \ \cong\ \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_c, c\in W(b)]. \tag{2.31}$$

This representation is the (parabolically) induced $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$-module generated by the image $X_+$ of $X_{b_+}$ subject to

$$\begin{aligned} T_i(X_+) \ &=\ t_i^{1/2}X_+ \ \text{ if } \ (b_+,\alpha_i)=0,\ 1\le i\le n,\\ Y_a(X_+)\ &=\ q^{(a,u_{b_+}^{-1}(\rho_k)-b_+)}X_+,\ a\in B. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

It is true for arbitrary nonzero $q,t$.

Note the following explicit formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} s_i(X_c)\ &=\ (t_i^{1/2}T_i(X_c)) \ \text{ if } \ (c,\alpha_i)>0,\\ &=\ (t_i^{1/2}T_i(X_c))^{-1} \ \text{ if } \ (c,\alpha_i)<0,\\ T_i(X_c)\ &= t_i^{1/2}X_c \ \text{ if } \ (c,\alpha_i)=0,\\ \pi_r(X_c) &= X_{\pi_r(c)},\ c\in W(b),\ r\in O'. \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

Here $0\le i\le n,\ (c,\alpha_0)=-(c,\vartheta)$.

## 3. Macdonald polynomials

Continuing the previous section, we set

$$\mu\ =\mu^{(k)} = \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\frac{(1-X_\alpha q_\alpha^i)(1-X_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{i+1})}{(1-X_\alpha t_\alpha q_\alpha^i)(1-X_\alpha^{-1}t_\alpha q_\alpha^{i+1})}. \tag{3.1}$$

It is considered as a Laurent series with the coefficients in $\mathbf{Q}[t_\nu][[q_\nu]]$ for $\nu\in\nu_R$.

We denote the constant term of $f(X)$ by $\langle f\rangle$. Let $\mu_\circ \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mu/\langle\mu\rangle$, where

$$\langle\mu\rangle\ =\ \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{(1-q^{(\rho_k,\alpha)+i})^2}{(1-t_\alpha q^{(\rho_k,\alpha)+i})(1-t_\alpha^{-1}q^{(\rho_k,\alpha)+i})}. \tag{3.2}$$

Recall that $q^{(\rho_k,\alpha)} = q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)},\ t_\alpha = q_\alpha^{k_\alpha}$. This formula is from [C2]. It is nothing else but the Macdonald constant term conjecture from [M1].

The coefficients of the Laurent series $\mu_\circ$ are actually from the field of rationals $\mathbf{Q}(q,t) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathbf{Q}(q_\nu, t_\nu)$, where $\nu \in \nu_R$. One also has $\mu_\circ^* = \mu_\circ$ for the involution

$$X_b^* = X_{-b},\ t^* = t^{-1},\ q^* = q^{-1}.$$

This involution is the restriction of the anti-involution $\star$ from (2.16) to $X$-polynomilas (and Laurent series). These two properties of $\mu_\circ$ can be directly seen from the difference relations for $\mu$. We will prove the first in the next proposition.

Setting

$$\langle f, g\rangle_\circ \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \langle \mu_\circ f\ g^*\rangle = \langle g, f\rangle_\circ^* \text{ for } f, g \in \mathbf{Q}(q,t)[X], \tag{3.3}$$

we introduce the *nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials* $E_b(x) = E_b^{(k)} \in \mathbf{Q}(q,t)[X]$ for $b \in P$ by means of the conditions

$$E_b - X_b \in \oplus_{c\succ b}\mathbf{Q}(q,t)X_c,\ \langle E_b, X_c\rangle_\circ = 0 \text{ for } P \ni c \succ b. \tag{3.4}$$

They are well defined because the pairing is nondegenerate and form a basis in $\mathbf{Q}(q,t)[X]$.

This definition is due to Macdonald (for $k_{\rm sht} = k_{\rm lng} \in \mathbf{Z}_+$), who extended Opdam's nonsymmetric polynomials introduced in the differential case in [O2] (Opdam mentions Heckman's contribution in [O2]). The general case was considered in [C4].

Another approach is based on the $Y$-operators. See formulas (2.32) and (2.30) above, and also Proposition 2.4.

**Proposition 3.1.** *The polynomial representation is $\star$-unitary:*

$$\langle H(f), g\rangle_\circ = \langle f, H^\star(g)\rangle_\circ \textit{ for } H \in \mathcal{H\!\!H},\ f \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]. \tag{3.5}$$

*The polynomials $\{E_b, b \in P\}$ are unique (up to proportionality) eigenfunctions of the operators $\{L_f \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} f(Y_1, \cdots, Y_n), f \in \mathbf{Q}[X]\}$ acting in $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]$ :*

$$L_f(E_b) = f(q^{-b_\sharp})E_b, \quad \textit{where } b_\sharp \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} b - u_b^{-1}(\rho_k), \tag{3.6}$$

$$X_a(q^b) = q^{(a,b)} \textit{ for } a, b \in P,\ u_b = \pi_b^{-1}b \textit{ is from Section 1.} \tag{3.7}$$

□

In the previous section we denoted $Y, T$ acting in the polynomial representation by $\hat{Y}, \hat{T}$. Here and further we will mainly omit the hat (if it does not lead to confusion). Thus we have two equivalent definitions of the nonsymmetric polynomials. Both are compatible with the transfer to the intermediate subalgebras $\mathcal{H}^\flat$ and subspaces $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b] \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b, b \in B] \subset \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]$.

Let us check that the coefficients of $\mu_\circ$ and the Macdonald polynomials are rational functions in terms of $q_\nu, t_\nu$. We need to make the construction of $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\circ$ more abstract. A form $(f\,,\,g)$ will be called $*$-*bilinear* if

$$(3.8)\qquad (rf\,,\,g) \;=\; r\,(f\,,\,g) \;=\; (f\,,\,r^* g) \;\text{ for }\; r \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}.$$

**Proposition 3.2.** *i) Forms* $\langle f\,,\,g\rangle$ *on* $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]$ *satisfying (3.5) and which are* $*$*-bilinear are in one-to-one correspondence with* $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$*-linear maps* $\varpi:\ \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X] \to \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$ *such that*

$$(3.9)\qquad \varpi(T_i(u)) = t_i\,\varpi(u),\ \varpi(Y_a(u)) = q^{(a\,,\,\rho_k)}\varpi(u),\ i \geq 0,\ a \in P.$$

*Such a form is* $*$*-hermitian in the sense of (3.3) if and only if* $\varpi(f^*) = (\varpi(f))^*$. *Given* $\varpi$*, the corresponding form is* $\langle f\,,\,g\rangle = \varpi(fg^*)$.

*ii) Replacing* $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$ *by the field of rationals* $\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(q,t) = \mathbf{Q}(q^{1/(2m)}, t^{1/2})$ *in the definition of* $\mathcal{H}$ *and in the polynomial representation, there is a unique nonzero* $\varpi$ *up to proportionality. Namely, it is the restriction to*

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(q,t)[X] \subset \mathcal{H} \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(q,t)$$

*of the linear map* $\varpi_{ext}:\ \mathcal{H} \to \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(q,t)$ *uniquely determined from the relation* $H - \varpi_{ext}(H)\mathcal{I} \subset \mathfrak{J} \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=}$

$$\{\sum_{r\in O'}\big(H_r(\pi_r - 1) + (\pi_r - 1)H_r'\big) + \sum_{i=0}^{n}\big(H_i(T_i - t_i^{1/2}) + (T_i - t_i^{1/2})H_i'\big)\},$$

*where* $H_i, H_i', H_r, H_r' \in \mathcal{H}$*. Equivalently,*

$$(3.10)\qquad f(X) \;=\; \varpi(f) + \sum_{r\in O'}(\pi_r - 1)(h_r) + \sum_{i=0}^{n}(\hat{T}_i - t_i^{1/2})(h_i)$$

*for* $h_i,\ h_r \in \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(q,t)[X]$.

*Proof.* In the first place, given a form $\langle f, g\rangle$ satisfying (3.5), the corresponding linear form is of course $\varpi(f) = \langle f, 1\rangle$. It obviously satisfies (3.10). Its extension to $\mathcal{H}$ is $\varpi_{\text{ext}}(H) = \varpi(\hat{H}(1))$.

Now let $\varpi_{\text{unv}}$ be the projection $\mathcal{H\!H} \to \mathcal{H\!H}/\mathfrak{J}$. We set

$$\langle A\,,\,B\rangle_{\text{unv}} = \varpi_{\text{unv}}(AB^\star) \;=\; \langle B\,,\,A\rangle^*_{\text{unv}},$$

where the anti-involution acts naturally on $\mathcal{H\!H}/\mathfrak{J}$ thanks to the $\star$-invariance of $\mathfrak{J}$.

By construction,

$$\langle HA\,,\,B\rangle_{\text{unv}} \;=\; \varpi_{\text{unv}}(HAB^\star) \;=\; \varpi_{\text{unv}}(AB^\star H) \;=\; \langle A\,,\,H^\star B\rangle_{\text{unv}}$$

for $H = T_i, \pi_r$. Upon the restriction to $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]$,

$$(3.11)\quad \langle \hat{H}(f)\,,\,g\rangle \;=\; \langle f\,,\,H^\star(g)\rangle \;\text{ for }\; \langle f\,,\,g\rangle \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \varpi_{\text{unv}}(f(X)g(X)^*)$$

and such $H$. Obviously (3.11) holds when $H$ is the multiplication by a polynomial. So it is true for all $H \in \mathcal{H\!H}$. Thus the form $\langle f\,,\,g\rangle$ satisfies the same relations as $\langle f\,,\,g\rangle_\circ$. Namely, it is hermitian with respect to $^*$ and $\mathcal{H\!H}$-invariant with respect to $\star$. Recall that its values are in the vector space $\mathcal{H\!H}/\mathfrak{J}$ with a natural action of $\star$.

The form $\langle f\,,\,g\rangle$ is universal among such forms. To be more exact, an arbitrary $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$-valued linear form on $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]$ obeying the same relations as $\varpi_{\text{unv}}$ is the composition of $\varpi_{\text{unv}}$ and a homomorphism $\omega : \mathcal{H\!H}/\mathfrak{J} \to \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$. The latter has to satisfy the $\star$-invariance relations $\omega(H^\star) = \omega(H)^*$ for $H \in \mathcal{H\!H}$ to make the corresponding bi-form $*$-hermitian.

Let us switch from $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$ to the field of rationals $\mathbf{Q}(q,t)$. We already know that at least one form $\langle\;,\;\rangle$ exists for generic $q,t$ with the values in a proper completion of $\mathbf{Q}(q,t)$. It is given by (3.3) and is unique up to proportionality. Indeed, the polynomial representation is irreducible, the $Y$-operators are diagonalizable there, and the $Y$-spectrum is simple. Thus the space $\mathcal{H\!H}/\mathfrak{J}$ is one-dimensional upon proper completion, so it has to be one-dimensional over $\mathbf{Q}(q,t)$ as well. We get the rationality of the coefficients of $\mu_\circ$ and the coefficients of the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. $\square$

Following Proposition 3.1, the *symmetric Macdonald polynomials* $P_b = P_b^{(k)}$ can be introduced as eigenfunctions of the $W$-invariant operators $L_f = f(Y_1, \cdots, Y_n)$ defined for symmetric, i.e. $W$-invariant, polynomials $f$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L_f(P_b) &\;=\; f(q^{-b+\rho_k})P_b, \quad b \in P_-, \\ (3.12)\qquad P_b &\;=\; \sum_{c \in W(b)} X_c \quad \text{mod } \Sigma_+(b). \end{aligned}$$

Here it suffices to take the *monomial symmetric functions*, namely, $f_b = \sum_{c\in W(b)} X_c$ for $b\in P_-$.

The $P$-polynomials are pairwise orthogonal with respect to $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\circ$ as well as $\{E\}$. Since they are $W$-invariant, $\mu$ can be replaced by Macdonald's truncated theta function:

$$\delta\ =\delta^{(k)}=\prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\frac{(1-X_\alpha q_\alpha^i)(1-X_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^i)}{(1-X_\alpha t_\alpha q_\alpha^i)(1-X_\alpha^{-1}t_\alpha q_\alpha^i)}. \tag{3.13}$$

The corresponding pairing remains $*$-hermitian because $\delta_\circ$ is $*$-invariant.

These polynomials were introduced in [M2,M3]. Actually they appeared for the first time in Kadell's work (for some root systems). In one-dimensional case, they are due to Rogers (see [AI]).

The connection between $E$ and $P$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{b_-}\ &=\ \mathbf{P}_{b_+}E_{b_+},\ b_-\in P_-,\ b_+=w_0(b_-),\\ \mathbf{P}_{b_+}&\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=}\sum_{c\in W(b_+)}\prod_\nu t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_c)/2}\hat{T}_{w_c}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where $w_c\in W$ is the element of the least length such that $c=w_c(b_+)$. See [O2,M4,C4].

*Spherical polynomials.* Mainly we will use the following renormalization of the $E$-polynomials (see [C4]):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_b\ &\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=}\ E_b(X)(E_b(q^{-\rho_k}))^{-1},\quad \text{where}\\ E_b(q^{-\rho_k})\ &=\ q^{(\rho_k,b_-)}\prod_{[\alpha,j]\in\lambda'(\pi_b)}\Big(\frac{1-q_\alpha^j t_\alpha X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})}{1-q_\alpha^j X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

$$\lambda'(\pi_b)\ =\{[\alpha,j]\mid[-\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\lambda(\pi_b)\}. \tag{3.16}$$

We call them *spherical polynomials.* Explicitly (see (1.14)),

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'(\pi_b)\ =&\{[\alpha,j]\ \mid\ \alpha\in R_+,\\ &-(b_-,\alpha^\vee)>j>0\ \text{ if }\ u_b^{-1}(\alpha)\in R_-,\\ &-(b_-,\alpha^\vee)\ge j>0\ \text{ if }\ u_b^{-1}(\alpha)\in R_+\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Formula (3.15) is the Macdonald evaluation conjecture in the nonsymmetric variant.

Note that one has to consider only long $\alpha$ (resp., short) if $k_{\text{sht}}=0$, i.e. $t_{\text{sht}}=1$ (resp., $k_{\text{lng}}=0$) in this set. All formulas below involving $\lambda$ or $\lambda'$ have to be modified correspondingly in such case.

We have the following duality relations:

$$\mathcal{E}_b(q^{c_\sharp}) \;=\; \mathcal{E}_c(q^{b_\sharp}) \;\text{ for }\; b,c\in P,\; b_\sharp = b - u_b^{-1}(\rho_k), \tag{3.18}$$

justifying the definition above.

*Conjugations.* We now come to the formulas for the conjugations of the nonsymmetric polynomials, which are important in the theory of the Fourier transform. The automorphism $^*$ is well defined on $E_b$ because their coefficients are rational functions in terms of $q,t$.

**Proposition 3.3.** *The conjugation $*$ in the polynomial representation is induced by the involution $\eta$ of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$. The paring $\langle fg\mu_0\rangle$ induces on $\mathcal{HH}$ the anti-involution $\star\cdot\eta = \eta\cdot\star$. For $b\in B$,*

$$E_b^* \;=\; \prod_{\nu\in\nu_R} t_\nu^{l_\nu(u_b)-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\, T_{w_0}(E_{\varsigma(b)}), \quad \textit{where}\;\; \varsigma(b) = -w_0(b). \tag{3.19}$$

*Proof.* The conjugation $*$ sends $\hat{T}_i$ to $\hat{T}_i^{-1}$ for $0\le i\le n$ i.e. coincides with the action of $\star$ on $T_i$. This can be checked by a simple direct calculation. However $*$ is an involution in contrast to $\star$ which is anti-involution. By definition, the conjugation takes $X_b$ to $X_b^{-1}$ and fixes $\pi_r$ for $r\in O$. Using (2.17), we conclude that $*$ is induced by the involution $\eta$ of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$.

Applying (2.30) to $\varsigma(b)$,

$$T_{w_0}(E_{\varsigma(b)}) \bmod \Sigma_*(b) = \prod_{\nu\in\nu_R} t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2 - l_\nu(u_{\varsigma(b)})}\, X_{-b} \bmod \imath(\Sigma_*(b)).$$

Here $\imath$ sends $X_b\mapsto X_{-b}$ and fixes $q,t$. Obviously $\imath(\Sigma_*(b))$ coincides with $(\Sigma_*(b))^*$ and $l_\nu(u_{\varsigma(b)}) = l_\nu(u_b)$. This gives the coefficient of proportionality in (3.19).

Conjugating,

$$\eta(Y_c)(E_b^*) = q^{(c,b_\sharp)}E_b^* = q^{(w_0(c),w_0(b_\sharp))}E_b^* = q^{-(w_0(c),w_0(-b)_\sharp)}E_b^*.$$

The last transformation is possible because the automorphism $\varsigma = -w_0$ is compatible with the representations $b=\pi_b u_b$. Finally, $\eta(Y_c) = T_{w_0}Y_{w_0(c)}T_{w_0}^{-1}$ due to Proposition 2.2 (formula (2.20)), and $T_{w_0}^{-1}(E_b^*)$ has to be proportional to $E_{w_0(-b)}$. □

For the symmetric polynomials, $P_b^* = P_{\varsigma(b)},\ b\in P_-,$ which readily results from the orthogonality property and the second relation from (3.12).

The conjugation formula (3.19) gets simpler in the spherical normalization. Indeed,

$$q^{(\rho_k,b_-)} = \prod_{\nu\in\nu_R} t_\nu^{-l_\nu(b)/2},$$

and (3.15) reads

$$\begin{aligned} E_b(q^{-\rho_k}) \ &= \ \prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(u_b)/2} M_b, \\ M_b \ &= \ \prod_{[\alpha,j]\in\lambda'(\pi_b)} \Big(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{1/2} X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})}{1-q_\alpha^j X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where the factor $M_b$ is "real", i.e. $*$-invariant. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_b^* \ &= \ M_b^{-1}(E_b \prod_\nu t_\nu^{l_\nu(u_b)/2})^* \\ &= \prod_\nu t_\nu^{l_\nu(u_b)/2 - l_\nu(w_0)/2}\, T_{w_0}(E_{\varsigma(b)}) \\ &= \prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\, T_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(b)}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

We will give later a better proof of this relation without using (3.15). It will be based on the intertwining operators and the definition of the Fourier transform.

**Intertwining operators.** The *X-intertwiners* (see e.g. [C1]) are introduced as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i \ &= \ T_i + (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2})(X_{\alpha_i} - 1)^{-1}, \\ S_i &= (\phi_i)^{-1}\Phi_i, \ G_i = \Phi_i(\phi_i)^{-1}, \\ \phi_i \ &= \ t_i^{1/2} + (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2})(X_{\alpha_i} - 1)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

for $0 \le i \le n$. They belong to $\mathcal{H}$ extended by the field $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}(X)$ of rational functions in $\{X\}$. The elements $S_i$ and $G_i$ satisfy the same relations as $\{s_i, \pi_r\}$ do. Hence the map

$$\hat{w} \mapsto S_{\hat{w}} \ = \ \pi_r S_{i_l} \cdots S_{i_1}, \ \text{ where } \ \hat{w} = \pi_r s_{i_l} \cdots s_{i_1} \in \hat{W}, \tag{3.23}$$

is a well defined homomorphism from $\hat{W}$. The same holds for $G_{\hat{w}}$.

As to $\Phi_i$, they satisfy the relations for $\{T_i\}$ (i.e. the homogeneous Coxeter relations and those with $\pi_r$). So the decomposition in (3.23) has to be reduced.

It suffices to check these properties in the polynomial representation, where they are obvious since $S_i = s_i$ for $0 \le i \le n$. A direct proof is based on the following property of $\{\Phi\}$ :

$$\Phi_{\hat{w}} X_b \;=\; X_{\hat{w}(b)} \Phi_{\hat{w}},\ \hat{w} \in \hat{W}. \tag{3.24}$$

Here the elements $\Phi_{\hat{w}} = \Phi_{\pi_r} \Phi_{s_{i_l}} \cdots \Phi_{s_{i_1}}$ can be introduced for any choice of the reduced decomposition. Relation (3.24) fixes them uniquely up to left (or right) multiplications by functions of $X$. Since $\Phi_{\hat{w}} - T_{\hat{w}}$ is a combination of $T_{\hat{w}'}$ for $l(\hat{w}') < l(\hat{w})$, one gets that $\Phi_{\hat{w}}$ does not depend on the particular choice of the reduced decomposition of $\hat{w}$, and $\Phi$ has the desired multiplicative property.

We will also use that $\Phi_i,\ \phi_i$ are self-adjoint with respect to the anti-involution (2.16) and therefore

$$\Phi^\star_{\hat{w}} = \Phi_{\hat{w}^{-1}},\ S^\star_{\hat{w}} \;=\; G_{\hat{w}^{-1}},\ \hat{w} \in \hat{W}. \tag{3.25}$$

This gives that $G$ and $S$ are $\star$-unitary up to a functional coefficient of proportionality. Explicitly:

$$(G_{\hat{w}})^\star G_{\hat{w}} \;=\; \bigl((S_{\hat{w}})^\star S_{\hat{w}}\bigr)^{-1} \;= \tag{3.26}$$
$$\prod_{\alpha,j}\Bigl(\frac{t_\alpha^{1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{-1/2} X_\alpha}{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{1/2} X_\alpha}\Bigr),\ [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j] \in \lambda(\hat{w}).$$

To define the $Y$*-intertwiners* we apply the involution $\varepsilon$ to $\Phi_{\hat{w}}$ and to $S, G$. The $Y$-intertwiners satisfy the same $\star$-relations (3.25). The formulas can be easily calculated using (2.11). In the case of $GL_n$, one gets the intertwiners from [KnS]. For $i > 0$, the $X_{\alpha_i}$ in $\Phi_{s_i}$ are replaced by $Y_{\alpha_i}^{-1}$ without touching $T$ and $t$. We use that $\varepsilon$ sends nonaffine $T_i$ to $T_i^{-1}$, $t^{1/2}$ to $t^{-1/2}$, and transpose $X$ and $Y$.

When applying the $Y$-intertwiners to the spherical polynomials (or any eigenfunctions of the $Y$-operators) it is more convenient to use $\tau_+$ instead of $\varepsilon$. The following proposition is from [C1]. We set

$$\Phi_i^b \;=\; \Phi_i(q^{b_\sharp}) \;=\; T_i + (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2})(X_{\alpha_i}(q^{b_\sharp}) - 1)^{-1}, \tag{3.27}$$

$$G_i^b \;=\; (\Phi_i \phi_i^{-1})(q^{b_\sharp}) \;=\; \frac{T_i + (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2})(X_{\alpha_i}(q^{b_\sharp}) - 1)^{-1}}{t_i^{1/2} + (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2})(X_{\alpha_i}(q^{b_\sharp}) - 1)^{-1}}. \tag{3.28}$$

**Proposition 3.4.** *Given* $c \in P,\ 0 \le i \le n$ *such that* $(\alpha_i, c + d) > 0$,

$$E_b q^{-(b,b)/2} \;=\; t_i^{1/2} \tau_+(\Phi_i^c)(E_c) q^{-(c,c)/2} \quad \textit{for} \quad b = s_i(\!(c)\!) \tag{3.29}$$

*and the automorphism* $\tau_+$ *from (2.10). If* $(\alpha_i, c+d) = 0$ *then*

$$\tau_+(T_i)(e_c) \;=\; t_i^{1/2} e_c,\ 0 \le i \le n, \tag{3.30}$$

*which results in the relations* $s_i(E_c) = E_c$ *as* $i > 0$*. For* $b = \pi_r(\!(c)\!)$*, where the indices* $r$ *are from* $O'$*,*

$$q^{-(b,b)/2+(c,c)/2} E_b \;=\; \tau_+(\pi_r)(E_c) \;=\; X_{\omega_r} q^{-(\omega_r,\omega_r)/2} \pi_r(E_c). \tag{3.31}$$

□

We can reformulate the proposition using the spherical polynomials. We will also replace $P$ by the lattice $Q \subset B \subset P$. All above considerations are compatible with the reduction $P \to B$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{E}_b \;&=\; \tau_+(\pi_r G_{i_l}^{c_l} \ldots G_{i_1}^{c_1})(1), \quad \text{where} \\ c_1 &= 0, c_2 = s_{i_1}(\!(c_1)\!), \ldots, c_l = s_{i_l}(\!(c_{l-1})\!), \quad \text{for} \quad \pi_b = \pi_r s_{i_l} \ldots s_{i_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

These polynomials do not depend on the particular choice of the decomposition of $\pi_b$ (not necessarily reduced), and are proportional to $E_b$ for all $b \in B$:

$$\begin{aligned} E_b q^{-(b,b)/2} \;&=\; \prod_{1 \le p \le l} \bigl(t_{i_p}^{1/2} \phi_{i_p}(q^{c_p})\bigr)\ \widehat{E}_b \\ &=\; \prod_{[\alpha,j] \in \lambda'(\pi_b)} \Bigl(\frac{1 - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})}{1 - q_\alpha^j X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})}\Bigr)\ \widehat{E}_b. \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Combining (3.33) and (3.15), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}_b \;=\; q^{(-\rho_k + b_-, b_-)/2} \widehat{E}_b. \tag{3.34}$$

See [C1] for a proof which is not based on the explicit formulas.

As an application we get that a spherical polynomial $\mathcal{E}_b$ is well defined for $q, t \in \mathbf{C}^*$ if

$$\prod_{[\alpha,j] \in \lambda'(\pi_b)} \bigl(1 - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha x_a(t^\rho)\bigr) \;\neq\; 0. \tag{3.35}$$

## 4. Fourier transform on polynomials

We will begin with the norm-formula for the spherical polynomials. See [C1] Theorem 5.6, and [M3,C2,M4,C4]. Further $B$ will be any lattice between $Q$ and $P$, $\{b_i, 1 \le i \le n\}$ a basis of $B$, $\mathcal{H}^\flat$ the corresponding intermediate subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}$ . We also set $\hat{W}^\flat = B \cdot W \subset \hat{W}$, $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b] = \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b, b \in B]$, and replace $m$ by the least $\tilde{m} \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\tilde{m}(B,B) \subset \mathbf{Z}$ in the definition of the $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$.

**Proposition 4.1.** *For $b, c \in B$ and the Kronecker delta $\delta_{bc}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{E}_b, \mathcal{E}_c \rangle_\circ \ &= \ \langle \widehat{E}_b, \widehat{E}_c \rangle_\circ \ = \ \delta_{bc}\mu^{-1}(q^{b_\sharp})\mu(q^{-\rho_k}) = \\ &\delta_{bc} \prod_{[\alpha,j]\in\lambda'(\pi_b)} \Big( \frac{t_\alpha^{1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{-1/2} X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})}{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{1/2} X_\alpha(q^{\rho_k})} \Big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

*Proof.* Using (3.32) and that $\tau_+$ is $\star$-unitary,

$$\langle \widehat{E}_b, \widehat{E}_b \rangle_\circ = \langle \tau_+(G_{\pi_b})(1)\, ,\, \tau_+(G_{\pi_b})(1) \rangle_\circ = \langle G^\star_{\pi_b} G_{\pi_b}(1)\, ,\, 1 \rangle_\circ.$$

Hence we can apply (3.26) substituting $X_\alpha \mapsto X_\alpha(q^{-\rho_k})$. $\square$

*Discretization.* This proposition will be interpreted as calculation of the Fourier transform from the polynomial representation to the functional representation of $\mathcal{H}^\flat$. The latter depends on $n$ independent parameters denoted by the formal exponentials $q^{\xi_i}$ for $\{1 \le i \le n\}$.

We set

$$\begin{aligned} X_a(q^\xi) &\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \prod_{i=1}^n q^{l_i \xi_i}, \quad \text{where} \ \ a = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i b_i \in B, \\ X_a(bw) \ &= \ X_a(q^{b+w(\xi)}) \ = \ q^{(a,b)} X_{w^{-1}(a)}(q^\xi), \\ \hat{u}(g)(bw) \ &= \ g(\hat{u}^{-1}bw), \ b \in B, w \in W. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Note that $b + w(\xi) = (bw)(\!(\xi)\!)$.

These formulas naturally determines the *discretization homomorphism* $g(X) \mapsto \delta(g)(\hat{w})$ (depending on $\xi$) which maps the space of rational functions $g \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}(X)$ or more general functions of $X$ to

$$\mathfrak{F}[\xi] \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathrm{Funct}(\hat{W}^\flat, \mathbf{Q}_\xi)$$

formed by $\mathbf{Q}_\xi$-valued functions on $\hat{W}^\flat$.

Here and further $\mathbf{Q}_\xi \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}(q^{\xi_1},\ldots,q^{\xi_n})$. We omit $\delta$ when it is clear that $\mathfrak{F}[\xi]$ is considered.

This homomorphism can be naturally extended to the operator algebra $\mathfrak{A} \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \oplus_{\hat{u}\in\hat{W}^\flat}\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}(X)\hat{u}$. For instance, the discretizations $\delta(\hat{H})$ of the operators $\hat{H}$ for $H\in\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ are well-defined and we get the action of $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ in $\mathfrak{F}_\xi$. We will call the latter the *functional representation.* It contains the image of the polynomial representation as an $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ -submodule.

Explicitly, $\delta(X_a)$ is (the multiplication by) the discretization of $X_a$, $\delta(\pi_r)=\pi_r$, for $\pi_r\in\Pi^\flat$, and

$$\delta(T_i(g))(\hat{w}) \ = \ \frac{t_i^{1/2}X_{\alpha_i}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{(\alpha_i,b)}-t_i^{-1/2}}{X_{\alpha_i}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{(\alpha_i,b)}-1}\, g(s_i\hat{w})$$

$$-\frac{t_i^{1/2}-t_i^{-1/2}}{X_{\alpha_i}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{(\alpha_i,b)}-1}\, g(\hat{w}) \ \text{ for } \ 0\le i\le n, \ \hat{w}=bw. \tag{4.3}$$

The map $\delta$ is a $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ -homomorphism.

The inner product corresponding to the anti-involution $\star$ of $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ is given by the discretization of the function $\mu_\bullet(X)=\mu(X)/\mu(q^\xi)$ :

$$\mu_\bullet(\hat{w}) \ = \ \prod_{\alpha,j}\Big(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2}-q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{1/2}X_\alpha(q^\xi)}{t_\alpha^{1/2}-q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{-1/2}X_\alpha(q^\xi)}\Big), \ [\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\lambda(\hat{w}). \tag{4.4}$$

Actually we will use only $\delta(\mu_\bullet)$, so by $\mu_\bullet$, we mean the discretization of $\mu_\bullet$.

We put formally $\xi^*=\xi$. To be more exact, $(q^{\xi_i})^* \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} q^{-\xi_i}$ for $1\le i\le n$. Then $\mu_\bullet(\hat{w})^*=\mu_\bullet(\hat{w})$. The counterpart of $\langle\,\rangle$ is the sum

$$\langle f\rangle_\xi \ \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \ \sum_{\hat{w}\in\hat{W}^\flat} f(\hat{w}).$$

The corresponding pairing is as follows:

$$\langle f,g\rangle_\bullet \ = \ \langle fg^*\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi \ = \sum_{\hat{w}\in\hat{W}^\flat}\mu_\bullet(\hat{w})f(\hat{w})\ g(\hat{w})^* \ = \ \langle g,f\rangle_\bullet^*. \tag{4.5}$$

Here $f,g$ are from the $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ -submodule of finitely supported functions $\mathbf{F}[\xi]\subset\mathfrak{F}[\xi]$.

Given $H\in\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ ,

$$\langle H(f),g\rangle_\bullet \ = \ \langle f,H^\star(g)\rangle_\bullet, \ \ \langle H(f)\,g\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi = \ \langle f\,\eta(H)^\star(g)\rangle_\xi. \tag{4.6}$$

To justify (4.6), one can follow the case of $\langle\,\rangle$ or simply use the homomorphism $\delta$. See Proposition 3.1. Note that the operators $T_i, X_b$ are unitary for the former pairing and self-adjoint with respect to the latter.

The *characteristic functions* $\chi_{\hat{w}}$ and *delta-functions* $\delta_{\hat{w}}$ in $\mathbf{F}[\xi](\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat)$ are defined from the relations

$$\chi_{\hat{w}}(\hat{u}) \;=\; \delta_{\hat{w},\hat{u}},\ \delta_{\hat{w}}(\hat{u}) \;=\; \mu_\bullet(\hat{w})^{-1}\chi_{\hat{w}}$$

for the Kronecker delta. We have usual formulas:

$$X_b(\chi_{\hat{w}}) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \delta(X_b)(\chi_{\hat{w}}) \;=\; X_b(\hat{w})\chi_{\hat{w}},\ b \in B, \hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat.$$

When considering concrete special (non-generic) $\xi \in \mathbf{C}^n$, one need to check that all above formulas are well defined (the denominators in (4.3), (4.4) are nonzero).

Note that $\mu_\bullet(\hat{w}) = 1$ if $q^{b+w(\xi)} = q^\xi$, i.e. $q^{(b+w(\xi),a)} = q^{(\xi,a)}$ for all $a \in B$, provided that $\mu_\bullet$ is well defined. However it is not true, generally speaking, if (4.4) is used as a definition of $\mu_\bullet(\hat{w})$, without any reference to $\mu_\bullet(X)$.

The main example discussed in the paper is the following specialization: $\xi = -\rho_k$. More precisely, $q^{(\xi,b)} \mapsto q^{-(\rho_k,b)}$ for $b \in B$. The $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ -module $\mathbf{F}(-\rho_k)$ becomes reducible. Namely,

$$\mathbf{I}_\sharp \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \oplus_{\hat{w}\not\in\pi_B}\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\chi_{\hat{w}} \subset \mathbf{F}(-\rho_k) \ \text{ and } \ \mathbf{F}_\sharp \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathbf{F}(-\rho_k)/\mathbf{I}_\sharp \tag{4.7}$$

are $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ -modules. We denote $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\bullet$ by $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\sharp$ in this case. Respectively, $\langle\,\rangle_\sharp = \langle\,\rangle_{-\rho_k}$. Since $\mathbf{I}_\sharp$ is the radical of this pairing it is a $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ -submodule.

Here $\mathbf{F}_\sharp$ can be identified with the space of finitely supported $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$-valued functions on $\pi_B = \{\pi_b, b \in B\}$. It is irreducible for generic $q, t$. The $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ -module $\mathfrak{F}_\sharp = \mathrm{Funct}(\pi_B, \mathbf{Q}_{q,t})$ is its natural completion.

Note that $X_a(\pi_b) = X_a(q^{b_\sharp})$. Therefore $\pi_B$ can be naturally identified with the set $B_\sharp = \{b_\sharp = b - u_b^{-1}(\rho_k)\}$ for generic $k$.

The $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ -invariance of $\mathbf{I}_\sharp$ (see [C1] and [C4]) can be seen directly from (1.29) and the following general (any $\xi$) relations:

$$\begin{aligned} T_i(\chi_{\hat w}) \ &= \ \frac{t_i^{1/2}X_{\alpha_i}^{-1}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{-(\alpha_i,b)}-t^{-1/2}}{X_{\alpha_i}^{-1}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{-(\alpha_i,b)}-1}\,\chi_{s_i\hat w}\\ &\qquad -\frac{t_i^{1/2}-t_i^{-1/2}}{X_{\alpha_i}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{(\alpha_i,b)}-1}\,\chi_{\hat w}\ \text{ for }\ 0\le i\le n,\\ \pi_r(\chi_{\hat w}) \ &= \ \chi_{\pi_r\hat w}\ \text{ for }\ \pi_r\in\Pi^\flat,\ \hat w=bw\in\hat W^\flat. \end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

For further references, the delta-counterparts of these formulas are:

$$\begin{aligned} T_i(\delta_{\hat w}) \ &= \ \frac{t_i^{1/2}X_{\alpha_i}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{(\alpha_i,b)}-t^{-1/2}}{X_{\alpha_i}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{(\alpha_i,b)}-1}\,\delta_{s_i\hat w}\\ &\qquad -\frac{t_i^{1/2}-t_i^{-1/2}}{X_{\alpha_i}(q^{w(\xi)})q^{(\alpha_i,b)}-1}\,\delta_{\hat w}\ \text{ for }\ 0\le i\le n. \end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

The action of $\pi_r$ remains the same as for $\{\chi\}$ because $\mu_\bullet(\pi_r\hat w)=\mu_\bullet(\hat w)$.

**Basic transforms.** We introduce the *Fourier transform* $\varphi_\circ$ and the *skew Fourier transform* $\psi_\circ$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\circ(f)(\pi_b) \ &= \ \langle f(X)\mathcal{E}_b(X)\mu_\circ\rangle,\ b\in B,\\ \psi_\circ(f)(\pi_b) \ &= \ \langle f(X)^*\mathcal{E}_b(X)\mu_\circ\rangle=\langle \mathcal{E}_b,f\rangle_\circ. \end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

They are isomorphisms from the space of polynomials $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]\ni f$ onto $\mathbf{F}_\sharp$. The $\varphi_\circ$ is $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$-linear, the $\psi_\circ$ conjugates $q,t$ (sends $q\mapsto q^{-1},\ t\mapsto t^{-1}$). The other two transforms will be defined later in this section.

We will denote the characteristic and delta-functions $\chi_{\hat w},\delta_{\hat w}\in\mathbf{F}_\sharp$ for $\hat w=\pi_b$ by $\chi_b^\pi,\delta_b^\pi$ respectively.

**Theorem 4.2.** *The Fourier transform $\varphi_\circ$ is unitary, i.e sends $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\circ$ to $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\sharp$, and induces the automorphism $\sigma$ on $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ : $\varphi_\circ(H(p)) = \delta(\sigma(H))(\varphi_\circ(p))$ for $p(X)\in\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]$, $H\in\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ . Respectively, $\psi_\circ$ is unitary too and induces the involution $\varepsilon$. Explicitly,*

$$\psi_\circ:\sum g_b\mathcal{E}_b(X)\mapsto\sum g_b^*\delta_b^\pi\ \in\ \mathbf{F}_\sharp,\quad \textit{for}\ \ g_b\in\mathbf{Q}_{q,t},\tag{4.11}$$

*which is equivalent to the relations*

$$\mathcal{E}_b(X)\ =\ \varepsilon(G_{\pi_b})(1)\ \ \textit{for}\ \ b\in B,\tag{4.12}$$

*and results in the formula*

$$\varphi_\circ : \sum g_b \mathcal{E}_b(X) \mapsto \sum g_b \prod_\nu t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2}\, T_{w_0}^{-1}(\delta^\pi_{\varsigma(b)})$$

$$\textit{for}\ \ g_b \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t},\ \varsigma(b) = -w_0(b). \tag{4.13}$$

*Proof.* Let us begin with $\psi$ (the subscript "$\circ$" will be dropped until "noncompact" Fourier transforms appear). We use the definition of $\mathcal{E}_b$, the duality relations (3.18), and of course the fact that the polynomial representation is $\star$-unitary (see (2.16),(3.5)). The duality relations are needed in the form of the *Pieri rules* from [C4], Theorem 5.4. Namely, we use that given $a \in B$, $X_a^{-1}\mathcal{E}_b(X)$ is a transformation of $Y_a(\delta^\pi_b)$ when the delta-functions $\delta^\pi_c$ are replaced by $\mathcal{E}_c$ (see (4.9)). This readily gives that $\psi$ induces $\varepsilon$ on the double Hecke algebra. Since $\varepsilon$ is unitary and both the polynomial representation and $\mathbf{F}_\sharp$ are irreducible (for generic $q, t$) we get that $\psi$ is unitary up to a constant. The constant is 1 because the image of $\mathcal{E}_1 = 1$ is $\delta^\pi_0 = \delta_{\text{id}} = \chi^\pi_0$.

Thus formula (4.11) is a reformulation of (4.1). Another way to check it is based on the technique of intertwiners. See [C1], Corollary 5.2, Proposition 3.4 above, and formula (3.34).

Turning to $\varphi$, we will use the involution $\eta = \varepsilon\sigma$ sending $T_i \mapsto T_i^{-1}$ $(0 \le i \le n)$, $X_b \mapsto X_b^{-1}$, and $\pi_r \mapsto \pi_r$. It is an automorphism of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$, conjugating $q, t$.

Recall that $\eta$ extends the conjugation $*$ in the polynomial representation. Therefore the transformation of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ corresponding to $\varphi$ is the composition $\varepsilon\eta = \sigma$. This gives that $\varphi$ is unitary.

Concerning (4.12), we apply $\psi$ to the relations

$$\delta^\pi_b \ = \ G_{\pi_b}(\delta^\pi_0) \ \ \text{for} \ \ b \in B. \tag{4.14}$$

To get (4.13), we can combine (4.11) with (3.21) which states that

$$\mathcal{E}^*_b \ = \ \prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\, T_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(b)}). \tag{4.15}$$

Let us give another proof of this formula which doesn't require the exact value of the coefficient of proportionality in $\mathcal{E}^*_b \ = \ C_b T_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(b)})$ and automatically gives its value.

What we have proved can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{E}_b\,\mathcal{E}_c\mu_\circ\rangle \ &=\ C_b^{-1}\langle (T_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_b))^*\mathcal{E}_c\mu_\circ\rangle\\ &=\ C_b^{-1}T_{w_0}^{-1}(\delta^\pi_{\varsigma(b)})(\pi_c).\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

Here the left-hand side is $b\leftrightarrow c$- symmetric.

On the other hand,

$$T_{w_0}^{-1}(\delta^\pi_b)(\pi_c)\ =\ \langle T_{w_0}^{-1}(\delta^\pi_b)\delta^\pi_c\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp,\tag{4.17}$$

where the last expression is $b\leftrightarrow c$- symmetric, thanks to formula (4.6).

Therefore the multiplier $C_b$ doesn't depend on $b$ and must be exactly as in (4.15). □

**Corollary 4.3.** *Given* $b,c\in P$,

$$\langle \mathcal{E}_b\,\mathcal{E}_c\mu_\circ\rangle\ =\ \prod_\nu t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2}\,T_{w_0}^{-1}(\delta^\pi_{\varsigma(b)})(\pi_c).\tag{4.18}$$

*The pairing* $\langle\!\langle f\,,\,g\rangle\!\rangle \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\langle f\,,\,T_{w_0}(g^\varsigma)\mu_\circ\rangle$ *is symmetric on* $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X]$. *Here* $g^\varsigma(X)=g(w_0(X)^{-1})$. *The corresponding anti-involution is the composition* $\eta\cdot\star\cdot T_{w_0}\cdot\varsigma=\sigma^2\cdot\eta\cdot\star$, *where by* $T_{w_0}$ *we mean the corresponding conjugation. It sends*

$$T_i\mapsto T_i\ (1\le i\le n),\ \ Y_b\mapsto Y_b,\ \ X_b\mapsto T_{w_0}^{-1}X_{\varsigma(b)}T_{w_0}\ (b\in P).\tag{4.19}$$

*On has:* $\langle\!\langle \mathcal{E}_b\,,\,\mathcal{E}_c\rangle\!\rangle\ =\ \delta_{bc}\mu^{-1}(q^{b_\sharp})\mu(q^{-\rho_k})$. *Assuming that* $0<q<1$ *and imposing the inequalities* $1+(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+k_\alpha>0$ *for all* $\alpha\in R_+$, *this paring is positive and therefore the polynomial representation is irreducible. For instance, if* $k_{sht}=k=k_{lng}$, *than the latter inequalities mean that* $k>-1/h$ *for the Coxeter number* $h=(\rho,\vartheta)+1$.

□

We will introduce the other two Fourier transforms by conjugating (4.10):

$$\begin{aligned}\bar\varphi_\circ(f)(\pi_b)\ &\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=}\ \langle f(X)\mathcal{E}_b(X)^*\mu_\circ\rangle\ =\ \langle f\,,\,\mathcal{E}_b\rangle_\circ,\\ \bar\psi_\circ(f)(\pi_b)\ &\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=}\ \langle f(X)^*\mathcal{E}_b(X)^*\mu_\circ\rangle,\ b\in B.\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

Let us "conjugate" Theorem 4.2.

**Theorem 4.4.** *The Fourier transforms* $\bar\varphi$, $\bar\psi_\circ$ *are unitary, i.e transform* $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\circ$ *to* $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\sharp$. *They induce the automorphisms* $\sigma^{-1}$ *and* $\eta\sigma$ *on*

$\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ *respectively and send*

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\varphi}_\circ : \sum g_b\mathcal{E}_b(X) \mapsto \sum g_b\delta_b^\pi \quad \textit{for} \ \ b\in B, g_b\in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t},\\ &\bar{\psi}_\circ : \sum g_b\mathcal{E}_b(X) \mapsto \sum g_b^* \prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}T_{w_0}(\delta_b^\pi). \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

$\square$

*Gauss integrals.* We introduce the *Gaussians* $\gamma^{\pm 1}$ as $W$-invariant solutions of the following system of difference equations:

$$\omega_j(\gamma) \ = \ q^{(\omega_i,\omega_i)/2}X_i^{-1}\gamma, \ \omega_i(\gamma^{-1}) \ = \ q^{-(\omega_i,\omega_i)/2}X_i\gamma^{-1} \tag{4.22}$$

for $1\le i\le n$. In the current setup, we need the Laurent series

$$\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum_{b\in B} q^{(b,b)/2}X_b. \tag{4.23}$$

Analytically, the values of $\tilde{\gamma}$ on any $q^z$ $(z\in\mathbf{C})$ are well defined if $|q|<1$. However we will mainly operate in formal series in this section.

The multiplication by $\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}$ preserves the space of Laurent series with coefficients from $\mathbf{Q}[[q^{1/(2\tilde{m})}]]$. Recall that $\tilde{m}\in\mathbf{N}$ is the smallest positive integer such that $\tilde{m}(B,B)\subset\mathbf{Z}$. For instance, we can multiply $\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}$ by the $q$-expansions of $\mathcal{E}_b(X)$ and $\mu_\circ$, which is a Laurent series with coefficients in $\mathbf{Q}[t][[q]]$. The $q$-expansions of the coefficients of $\mathcal{E}_b$ (which are rational functions in terms of $q,t$) belong to $\mathbf{Q}[t^{\pm1}][[q]]$.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Given $b,c\in B$ and the corresponding spherical polynomials $\mathcal{E}_b,\mathcal{E}_c$,*

$$\langle\mathcal{E}_b\mathcal{E}_c\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle \ = \ q^{(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2+(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2-(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\mathcal{E}_c(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle, \tag{4.24}$$

$$\langle\mathcal{E}_b\mathcal{E}_c^*\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle \ = \ q^{(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2+(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2-(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\mathcal{E}_c^*(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle, \tag{4.25}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\mathcal{E}_b^*\mathcal{E}_c^*\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle \ &= \ q^{(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2+(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2-(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\\ &\times\prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}T_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_c^*)(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

*where the coefficients of $\mu_\circ$, $\mathcal{E}_b$, $\mathcal{E}_c$, and $\mathcal{E}_c^*$ are expanded in terms of positive powers of $q$. Here the coefficient of proportionality can be calculated explicitly:*

$$\langle\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle \ = \ \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}\Big). \tag{4.27}$$

*The proof* is based on the following fact: $\hat{H}\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} = \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\tau_+(\hat{H})$ in the polynomial representation extended by the Gaussian, where $H \in \mathcal{HH}$ and the mapping $H \mapsto \hat{H}$ is from Theorem 2.1, Section 2. Indeed, the conjugation by $\tilde{\gamma}$ corresponds to $\tau_+$ on the standard generators $X_b(b \in B)$, $T_i(0 \le i \le n)$, $\pi_r(r \in O')$. To be more exact, $\hat{H}\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}$ coincides with $\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}(\tau_+(H))\hat{}$ for all $H \in \mathcal{HH}^\flat$ . It can be readily deduced from the $W$-invariance of $\tilde{\gamma}$ and (4.22).

The same holds in the functional representations $\mathfrak{F}[\xi]$ if we take

$$\gamma^{\pm 1}(bw) \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} q^{\pm(b+w(\xi),b+w(\xi))/2},\ b \in B,\ w \in W. \tag{4.28}$$

Here we need to extend the field of constants $\mathbf{Q}_\xi$ by $q^{\pm(\xi,\xi)/2}$. We can easily avoid this by removing $\pm(\xi,\xi)/2$ from the exponent of (4.28), since we need the Gaussian only up to proportionality. However we prefer to stick to the standard $\gamma(q^z) = q^{(z,z)/2}$ in this section.

Involving Theorem 4.2 we conclude that the map

$$\varphi_\gamma : f(X) \mapsto f'(\pi_b) = \gamma^{-1}(b_\sharp)\langle f\mathcal{E}_b\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle,$$

induces the involution $\tau_+^{-1}\sigma\tau_+^{-1} = \tau_-^{-1}$ on $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$. Note that $\gamma(b_\sharp)$ is nothing else but $\gamma(\pi_b)$ evaluated at $\xi = -\rho_k$. The map $\varphi_\gamma$ acts from $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]$ to the $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ -module $\mathfrak{F}_\sharp$, where the field of constants is extended by $q^{-(\xi,\xi)/2}$.

The automorphism $\tau_-$ fixes the $Y$-operators. Hence the image of $f = \mathcal{E}_c$ is an eigenfunction of the discretizations $\delta(Y_a)$ of the $Y_a(a \in B)$ corresponding to the same set of eigenvalues as for $\mathcal{E}_c$. Let us prove that $\varphi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_c)$ has to be proportional to the discretization $\delta(\mathcal{E}_c)$ of $\mathcal{E}_c$.

In the first place, we may assume that $c = 0$ employing the $Y$-intertwiners (see (3.32)). The images of the $Y$-intertwiners with respect to $\tau_-^{-1}$ can be exactly calculated but we do not need explicit formulas here. It is sufficient to know that they are invertible operators acting in $\mathfrak{F}_\sharp$. The function $g = \varphi_\gamma(1)$ has additional symmetries: $t_i^{-1/2}\delta(T_i)(g) = g = \delta(\pi_r)(g)$. We have used that $\tau_-$ fixes $T_i$ and $\pi_r$ for all $i, r$ (see (2.15)). This readily leads to the $\hat{W}^\flat$-invariance of $g$, which means that it has to be constant.

Setting $\varphi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_c) = h_c\gamma(\pi_c)q^{-(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\delta(\mathcal{E}_c)$ for $h_c \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$, we need to check that $h_c = 1$. It is true for $h_0$. However $h_c = h_b$ for all $c, b \in B$ because both the left-hand and the right-hand sides of (4.24) are $b \leftrightarrow c$ symmetric. The first symmetry is obvious, the second is the duality relation (3.18).

The second formula can be easily deduced from the first thanks to (4.15):

$$\mathcal{E}_c^* \;=\; \prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\, T_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(c)}),\ \varsigma(c) = -w_0(c).$$

Indeed, $T_{w_0}$ commutes with $\gamma$ and its Fourier transform is the discretization of $\sigma(T_{w_0}) = T_{w_0}$. Applying this argument one more time we get (4.26). The (conjugation of the) latter formula will be important to construct the inverse Fourier transform in the next section. A direct proof of (4.25), without the conjugation formula, is also not difficult. Here it is.

First, $\mathcal{E}_c^*$ are eigenfunctions of the operators $\eta(Y_a)$, where $\eta = \varepsilon\sigma$ (see above). The images of these operators under $\varphi_\gamma$ are $\tau_-^{-1}(\eta(Y_a)$. One has:

$$\tau_-^{-1}\eta = \tau_-^{-1}\varepsilon\sigma = \varepsilon\tau_+^{-1}\sigma = \varepsilon\tau_-^{-1}\tau_+ = \varepsilon\sigma\tau_- = \eta\tau_-.$$

Therefore $\varphi_\gamma$ fixes $\eta(Y_a)$ and $\varphi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_c^*)$ is proportional to $\delta(\mathcal{E}_c^*)$ for any $a, c \in B$.

Second, we introduce $\hat{h}$ from $\varphi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_c^*) = \hat{h}_c\gamma(\pi_c)q^{-(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\delta(\mathcal{E}_c^*)$. However now is not obvious that the left-hand side of (4.25) is symmetric $(a \leftrightarrow b)$ as it was for (4.24).

We need to involve

$$\psi_\gamma : f(X) \mapsto \gamma^{-1}(b)\langle f^*\mathcal{E}_b\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle.$$

It induces the automorphism $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \tau_+^{-1}\varepsilon\tau_+$. Indeed, $\langle f^*\mathcal{E}_b\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle = \langle (f\tilde{\gamma})^*\mathcal{E}_b\mu_\circ\rangle$.

Since

$$\eta(Y_a) = \varepsilon\tau_-^{-1}\tau_+\tau_-^{-1}(Y_a) = \tau_+^{-1}\varepsilon\tau_+(Y_a) = \tilde{\varepsilon}(Y_a),$$

$\psi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_c)$ is proportional to $\delta(\mathcal{E}_c^*)$. Therefore letting

$$\psi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_c^*) = \tilde{h}_c\gamma(\pi_c)q^{-(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\delta(\mathcal{E}_c^*),$$

we conclude that $\hat{h}_c = \tilde{h}_b$ for all $b, c \in B$. Hence both functions $\hat{h}, \tilde{h}$ are constants and, moreover, equal 1 thanks to the normalization of $\mathcal{E}_b$.

The explicit formula for $\langle\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mu_\circ\rangle$ was calculated in [C5] using the shift operators and the analytic continuation. $\square$

We remark that the product $\mu\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}$ generalizes the (radial) Gaussian measure in the theory of Lie groups and symmetric spaces. To be more exact, the “noncompact” case, which will be considered next, is such a generalization. The above setup can be called “compact”, because taking the constant term corresponds to the integration with respect to the imaginary period.

We would like to mention that the appearance of the nonsymmetric polynomials has no known counterparts in the classical representation theory even in the so-called group case when $k = 1$, i.e. $t = q$. In this case, the symmetric Macdonald polynomials become the characters of the compact Lie groups, and one can expect the nonsymmetric polynomials to be somehow connected with these representations. However it does not happen. There are certain relations of the (degenerate) nonsymmetric polynomials with the Demazure character formulas (the Kac-Moody case, essentially basic representations). However it looks more accidental than conceptual. It merely reflects the fact that both constructions are based on the Demazure operations.

In the group case, the symmetrizations of (4.24) and (4.25) can be readily deduced from the Weyl character formula. It seems that these formulas were not used in the harmonic analysis. Maybe because they cannot be extended to the Harish-Chandra zonal spherical functions on general symmetric spaces.

## 5. Jackson integrals

The formulas from the previous sections can be generalized for Jackson integrals taken instead of the constant term functional (corresponding to the imaginary integration over the period). It is a variant of the classical noncompact case. Another variant is a straightforward analytic integration in the real direction, which will not be discussed in the paper. We keep the same notation, expend all functions in terms of non-negative powers of $q$, and consider $q^{(\xi,b_i)}$ as independent parameters. One may also treat $\xi$ as complex vector in a general position assuming that $|q| < 1$.

The Jackson integral of $f(bw) \in \mathfrak{F}[\xi]$ is

$$\langle f\rangle_\xi \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum f(bw), \quad \text{where} \quad b \in B,\ w \in W.$$

Recall that $X_a(q^z) = q^{(a,z)}$, $X_a(bw) = q^{(a,w(\xi)+b)}$, $\gamma(q^z) = q^{(z,z)/2}$, and $\gamma(bw) = \gamma(q^{w(\xi)+b})$. Thus

$$|W|^{-1}\langle\gamma\rangle_\xi = \sum_{a\in B} q^{(\xi+a,\xi+a)/2} = \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}(q^\xi)q^{(\xi,\xi)/2}$$

for $\tilde{\gamma}$ from (4.23).

The Jackson inner product already appeared in (4.5). It is $\langle f,g\rangle_\bullet = \langle fg^*\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi$ for $\mu_\bullet$ from (4.4). To be more precise, here we need the discretization $\delta(\mu_\bullet)$.

The *Fourier-Jackson transform* $\varphi_\bullet$, the *skew Fourier-Jackson transform* $\psi_\bullet$, and their bar-counterparts are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_\bullet(f)(\pi_b) &= \langle f(\hat{w})\mathcal{E}_b(\hat{w})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi,\ b\in B,\\
\psi_\bullet(f)(\pi_b) &= \langle f(\hat{w})^*\mathcal{E}_b(\hat{w})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi = \langle \mathcal{E}_b, f\rangle_\bullet,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\varphi}_\bullet(f)(\pi_b) &= \langle f(\hat{w})\mathcal{E}_b^*(\hat{w})\mu_\bullet(\hat{w})\rangle_\xi,\ b\in B,\\
\bar{\psi}_\bullet(f)(\pi_b) &= \langle f(\hat{w})^*\mathcal{E}_b^*(\hat{w})\mu_\bullet(\hat{w})\rangle_\xi = \langle f, \mathcal{E}_b\rangle_\bullet.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

These transforms act from subspaces of $\mathfrak{F}[\xi]$ to proper completions of the space $\mathbf{F}_\sharp$, provided the convergence. The involution $*$ is the conjugation of the values of functions $f\in\mathfrak{F}[\xi]$. It is well defined because the values are rational functions in terms of $q,t$ (and their certain fractional powers). One has: $(f^*)(\hat{w}) = (\delta(f^*))(\hat{w}) = (\delta(f)(\hat{w}))^* = (f(\hat{w}))^*$. For instance, $\chi_{\hat{w}}^* = \chi_{\hat{w}}$, and $\delta_{\hat{w}}^* = \delta_{\hat{w}}$ since $\mu_\bullet(\hat{w})^* = \mu_\bullet(\hat{w})$. Thus in (4.10), (5.1) we can replace $\mathcal{E}_b^*(\hat{w})$ by $\mathcal{E}_b(\hat{w})^*$.

It is straightforward to check that the corresponding automorphisms of $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$ are the same as in Theorems 4.2 and 4.4. We simply replace $\langle\ \rangle$ by $\langle\ \rangle_\xi$ :

$$\varphi\leftrightarrow\sigma,\ \bar{\varphi}\leftrightarrow\sigma^{-1}, \psi\leftrightarrow\varepsilon,\ \bar{\psi}\leftrightarrow\eta\sigma. \tag{5.3}$$

These automorphisms commute with the anti-involution $\star$, so all transforms are $\star$- unitary up to a coefficient of proportionality provided the convergence and the irreducibility of the corresponding $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$-modules. Here $\xi$ is generic. For the spherical specialization we can be more precise.

**Theorem 5.1.** *i) For $\xi = -\rho_k$, the Fourier transforms from (4.10), (5.1) act from the space of delta-function $\mathbf{F}_\sharp$ to the discretization of the space $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]$ upon the restriction to the set $\pi_B$. They send the form $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\sharp$ to $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_\circ$, and satisfy the relations*

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\varphi}_\circ\cdot\varphi_\bullet &= id = \varphi_\circ\cdot\bar{\varphi}_\bullet,\\
\bar{\varphi}_\bullet\cdot\varphi_\circ &= id = \varphi_\bullet\cdot\bar{\varphi}_\circ,\\
\psi_\circ\cdot\psi_\bullet &= id = \bar{\psi}_\circ\cdot\bar{\psi}_\bullet,\\
\psi_\bullet\cdot\psi_\circ &= id = \bar{\psi}_\bullet\cdot\bar{\psi}_\circ.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

*ii) Setting* $\widehat{f}=\varphi_\circ(f)\in \mathbf{F}_\sharp$ *for* $f(X)\in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]$, *the inverse transform reads*

$$f(X) \;=\; \prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\langle\, \widehat{f}\, T^\bullet_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(b)})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp, \tag{5.5}$$

*where* $T^\bullet$ *acts on* $\mathcal{E}_b$ *via formula (4.9) for* $\delta_b^\pi=\delta_{\pi_b}$ :

$$T_i^\bullet(\mathcal{E}_b)=\frac{t_i^{1/2}q^{(\alpha_i,b_\sharp)}-t^{-1/2}}{q^{(\alpha_i,b_\sharp)}-1}\mathcal{E}_{s_i(b)}-\frac{t_i^{1/2}-t_i^{-1/2}}{q^{(\alpha_i,b_\sharp)}-1}\mathcal{E}_b, \tag{5.6}$$

*extended to* $W$ *naturally. Similarly, we have the Plancherel formula*

$$\begin{gathered}\langle f\, g\mu_\circ\rangle = t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\langle \widehat{f}\, T_{w_0}(\widehat{g}^\varsigma)\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\\ \text{for}\ \ f,g\in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b],\ \ h(\hat{w})^\varsigma=h(\varsigma(\hat{w})).\end{gathered} \tag{5.7}$$

*Proof* of i) is based on (5.3) and the irreducibility of the polynomial representation and its delta-counterpart $\mathbf{F}_\sharp$. The same argument gives the unitarity of the Fourier transforms under consideration up to proportionality. Thanks to the normalization of $\mu_\circ$ and $\mu_\bullet$,

$$\langle \delta_0,\delta_0\rangle_\sharp \;=\; 1 \;=\; \langle 1,1\rangle_\circ.$$

So the coefficient of proportionality is 1.

The explicit inversion formula from ii) is straightforward:

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi_\circ\Big(\prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\langle \widehat{f}\, T^\bullet_{w_0}(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(b)})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\Big)\\ &=\prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\langle \widehat{f}\, T^\bullet_{w_0}\phi_\circ(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(b)})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\\ &=\langle \widehat{f}\, T^\bullet_{w_0}\Big(\prod_\nu t_\nu^{-l_\nu(w_0)/2}\phi_\circ(\mathcal{E}_{\varsigma(b)})\Big)\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\\ &=\langle \widehat{f}\, T_{w_0}T_{w_0}^{-1}(\delta_b)\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp=\widehat{f}(\pi_b).\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Here we use (4.13). Let us check the Plancherel formula. The anti-involution corresponding to the symmetric form $\langle f\, g\mu_\circ\rangle$ is

$$\diamond \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \eta\cdot\star=\star\cdot\eta.$$

The one for the form $\langle \widehat{f}\, T_{w_0}(\widehat{g}^{\varsigma})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp$ can be readily calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\, \widehat{f}\ T_{w_0}(\varphi_\circ(H(g))^{\varsigma})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp = \langle\, \widehat{f}\ T_{w_0}\sigma(H^{\varsigma})(\widehat{g}^{\varsigma})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\\
=&\langle\, (T_{w_0}\sigma\varsigma(H)T_{w_0}^{-1})^{\diamond}(\widehat{f})\ T_{w_0}(\widehat{g}^{\varsigma})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\\
=&\langle\, (\sigma^{-1}(H))^{\diamond}(\widehat{f})\ T_{w_0}(\widehat{g}^{\varsigma})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\\
=&\langle\, \sigma(H^{\diamond})(\widehat{f})\ T_{w_0}(\widehat{g}^{\varsigma})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp = \langle\, (H^{\diamond}(f))\widehat{\ }\ T_{w_0}(\widehat{g}^{\varsigma})\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use that the Fourier transform $\varphi$ induces $\sigma$ on $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}$ , the relations (2.20):

$$T_{w_0}\sigma\varsigma(H)T_{w_0}^{-1} = \sigma^{-1}(H),$$

and (see the last line) formula

$$\sigma^{\diamond} = \diamond\cdot\sigma\cdot\diamond = \eta\sigma\eta = \varepsilon\sigma\varepsilon = \sigma^{-1}.$$

□

Part ii) of the Theorem generalizes the main theorem about $p$-adic spherical transform due to Macdonald (symmetric case) and Matsumoto (see [Ma] and resent [O4,O5]). The classical $p$-adic spherical transform acts from $\mathbf{F}_\sharp$ to the polynomials. So we need to reverse ii). The $\mathcal{E}_b^*$ generalize the $p$-adic (nonsymmetric) spherical functions due to Matsumoto. The limit $q \to \infty$ of the following Corollary is exactly the theory of spherical Fourier transform. The case of generic $\xi$ (in place of $-\rho_k$) is presumably connected with the general (non-spherical) Fourier transform on affine Hecke algebras [KL1] and is expected to be directly related to [HO2].

Note that the latter paper is devoted to affine Hecke algebras with arbitrary labels. Only equal labels are considered in [KL1]. There are Lusztig's papers towards nonequal labels. However the general labels unfit the "geometric" methods.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Setting* $\widehat{f} = \bar{\varphi}_\bullet(f) \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]$ *for* $f \in \mathbf{F}_\sharp$, *its inversion and the Plancherel formula are as follows:*

$$f \ = \ \prod_{\nu} t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2}\langle\, \widehat{f}\ T_{w_0}^{-1}(\mathcal{E}^*_{\varsigma(b)})\mu_\circ\rangle, \tag{5.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\, f\ \ g\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp \ &= \ t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2}\langle\, \widehat{f}\ T_{w_0}^{-1}(\widehat{g}^{\varsigma})\mu_\circ\rangle\\
&\textit{for}\ \ f,g \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b],\ h(X_b)^{\varsigma} = h(X_{w_0(b)}^{-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

*Gauss-Jackson integrals.* In a sense, these integrals are the missing part of the Harish-Chandra theory of spherical functions and the theory of the $p$-adic spherical transform. The formulas for the integrals of the Gaussians with respect to the Harish-Chandra (zonal) transform exist in the group case only ($k = 1$). The Gaussians cannot be added to the $p$-adic theory as well.

Let us transfer Theorem 4.5 from the compact case, with $\langle\rangle$ as the integration, to the Jackson case. The proof remains essentially unchanged. In fact, the formulas below are $*$-conjugations of (4.24) with a minor reservation about (4.27). See also Theorem 7.1 from [C5].

**Theorem 5.1.** *Given $b, c \in P$ and the corresponding spherical polynomials $\mathcal{E}_b, \mathcal{E}_c$,*

$$\langle \mathcal{E}_b\, \mathcal{E}_c^*\, \gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi \;=\; q^{-(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2-(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2+(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\mathcal{E}_c(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi, \tag{5.11}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{E}_b^*\, \mathcal{E}_c^*\, \gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi \;=\; q^{-(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2-(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2+(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\mathcal{E}_c^*(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi, \tag{5.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{E}_b\, \mathcal{E}_c\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi \;&=\; q^{-(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2-(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2+(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\\ &\times\prod_\nu t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2}T_{w_0}^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_c)(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi,\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

$$\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi = \mu(q^\xi, t^{-1})\,|W|^{-1}\langle\gamma\rangle_\xi \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{j=0}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{-(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-q_\alpha^{-(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}\Big). \tag{5.14}$$

*Here by $\mu(q^\xi, t^{-1})$ we mean the right-hand side of (3.1) evaluated at $X = q^\xi$ where all $t_\alpha$ are replaced by $t_\alpha^{-1}$.*

$\square$

In these formulas, $t$ is generic or complex provided that the discretization $\delta(\mu_\bullet) = \mu_\bullet(bw)$ is well defined and $\mathcal{E}_b, \mathcal{E}_c$ exist. Note that the right-hand side of (5.14) has to be replaced by the limit when $k_\nu \in \mathbf{Z}_+$.

We come to the inversion and Plancherel formulas. The pairings $\langle\, f\, g\mu_\circ\rangle$ and $\langle\, f\, g\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi$ can be naturally extended to the $\mathcal{H}^\flat$-modules $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]\tilde\gamma^{-1}$ and the discretization-image $\delta(\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]\gamma)$ of $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]\gamma$ in $\mathfrak{F}[\xi]$. We will use them for the Plancherel formulas.

We set $c_\xi = \langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi$. The Fourier transforms

$$\varphi^c \;=\; c_\xi^{-1}\varphi_\bullet \;\text{ and }\; \bar\varphi_\bullet^c \;=\; c_\xi^{-1}\bar\varphi_\bullet$$

transfer

$$\delta(Q_{q,t}[X_b]\gamma) \;\rightarrow\; \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]\tilde\gamma^{-1}.$$

Respectively, $\psi^c_\bullet, \bar\psi^c_\bullet$ preserve the first module.

In the compact case, setting $c = \langle \gamma\mu_\circ\rangle$,

$$\varphi^c_\circ = c^{-1}\varphi_\circ,\ \bar\varphi^c_\circ = c^{-1}\bar\varphi_\circ,\ \psi^c_\circ = c^{-1}\psi_\circ,\ \bar\psi^c_\circ = c^{-1}\bar\psi_\circ,$$

the first two transforms act from the second module to the first and the last two preserve the second module.

They satisfy the counterparts of the inversion formulas (5.4):

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar\varphi^c_\circ \cdot \varphi^c_\bullet &= \mathrm{id} = \varphi^c_\circ \cdot \bar\varphi^c_\bullet,\\
\bar\varphi^c_\bullet \cdot \varphi^c_\circ &= \mathrm{id} = \varphi^c_\bullet \cdot \bar\varphi^c_\circ,\\
\psi^c_\circ \cdot \psi^c_\circ &= \mathrm{id} = \bar\psi^c_\circ \cdot \bar\psi^c_\circ,\\
\psi^c_\bullet \cdot \psi^c_\bullet &= \mathrm{id} = \bar\psi^c_\bullet \cdot \bar\psi^c_\bullet.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

It is straightforward to reformulate part ii) of Theorem 5.1 for $\varphi^c$ and the pairings $\langle\, f\, g\mu_\circ\rangle$ on $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]\tilde\gamma^{-1}$ and $\langle\, f\, g\mu_\bullet\rangle_\xi$ on $\delta(\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]\gamma)$.

Theorem 5.1 and the above facts remain valid when $\xi = -\rho_k$. In this case,

$$\mu\ = \mu^{(k)} = \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\frac{(1-X_\alpha q_\alpha^i)(1-X_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{i+1})}{(1-X_\alpha t_\alpha q_\alpha^i)(1-X_\alpha^{-1}t_\alpha q_\alpha^{i+1})},$$

$$\mu(q^{-\rho_k}, t^{-1}) = \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{i=0}^{\infty}\frac{(1-q_\alpha^{-(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+i})(1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+i+1})}{(1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{-(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+i})(1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+i+1})}, \tag{5.16}$$

$$\mu_\bullet(bw) = \mu_\bullet(q^{-w(\rho_k)+b}) = \prod_{[\alpha,j]\in\lambda'(bw)}\Big(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - t_\alpha^{1/2}q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\rho_k)+j}}{t_\alpha^{1/2} - t_\alpha^{-1/2}q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\rho_k)+j}}\Big), \tag{5.17}$$

for $\lambda'(bw) = \{[-\alpha, j] \mid [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j] \in \lambda(bw)\}$, $\lambda(bw) = R^a_+ \cap (bw)^{-1}(R^a_-)$. The function $\mu_\bullet(bw)$ is always well defined and nonzero only as $\pi_b = bu_b^{-1}$ (for generic $q, t$). See (3.17) and (4.4). In this case, all $\alpha$ in the product (5.17) are positive.

Formula (5.14) now reads as follows:

$$\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp\ =\ |W|^{-1}\langle\gamma\rangle_\sharp\prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}\Big). \tag{5.18}$$

Recall that $\langle\ \rangle_\xi$ for $\xi = -\rho_k$ is denoted by $\langle\ \rangle_\sharp$. The inversion formulas for $\varphi$ get simpler:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{\varphi}_\circ \cdot \varphi_\bullet &= |W|^{-1}\langle\gamma\rangle_\sharp\,\mathrm{id} = \varphi_\circ \cdot \bar{\varphi}_\bullet,\\
\bar{\varphi}_\bullet \cdot \varphi_\circ &= |W|^{-1}\langle\gamma\rangle_\sharp\,\mathrm{id} = \varphi_\bullet \cdot \bar{\varphi}_\circ.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.19}
$$

**Macdonald's $\eta$-identities.** As a by-product, we can represent $\langle\gamma\rangle_\sharp$ as a theta-like product times a certain finite sum, provided that the left-hand side of (5.18) contains finitely many nonzero terms. It happens when a certain $\mathbf{Z}_+$-linear combination of $k_{\mathrm{sht}}, k_{\mathrm{lng}}$ is from $-\mathbf{N}$. The main example (which will be used later) is as follows. Let $q$ be generic such that $|q| < 1$.

We call a root $\alpha \in R_+$ *extreme* if $h_\alpha(k) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} (\rho_k, \alpha^\vee) + k_\alpha$ does not coincide with any $(\rho_k, \beta^\vee)$ for positive roots $\beta$, and *strongly extreme* if also $(\alpha, \omega_i) > 0$ for all $1 \le i \le n$. Note that $h_\vartheta(k)$ is $kh$ for the *Coxeter number* $h = (\rho, \vartheta) + 1$ in the case of coinciding $k$.

Here $k_{\mathrm{sht}}, k_{\mathrm{lng}}$ are treated as independent parameters. We omit the subscript of $k$ in the simply-laced case: $\rho_k = k\rho,\ h_\alpha(k) = ((\rho, \alpha) + 1)k$. In this case, there is only one extreme root, namely, $\vartheta$. Let us list the extreme roots for the other root systems (the notation is from [B]). All of them are short:

$B_n$) all short roots $\epsilon_i$ $(1 \le i \le n)$ where $h_{\epsilon_i}(k) = 2k_{\mathrm{sht}} + 2(n-i)k_{\mathrm{lng}}$;

$C_n$) $\vartheta = \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$ with $h_\vartheta(k) = 2(n-1)k_{\mathrm{sht}} + 2k_{\mathrm{lng}}$ and $\alpha = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_n$ with $h_\alpha(k) = n\,k_{\mathrm{sht}}$;

$F_4$) $0011, 0121, 1121, \vartheta = 1232$ with $h$ equal to $3k_{\mathrm{sht}},\ 4k_{\mathrm{sht}} + 2k_{\mathrm{lng}}$ $4k_{\mathrm{sht}} + 4k_{\mathrm{lng}},\ 6k_{\mathrm{sht}} + 6k_{\mathrm{lng}}$ respectively;

$G_2$) $\alpha_1$ $(h_{\alpha_1}(k) = 2k_{\mathrm{sht}}),\ \vartheta = 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ $(h_\vartheta(k) = 3(k_{\mathrm{sht}} + k_{\mathrm{lng}}))$.

Thus $\vartheta$ is a unique strongly extreme root for all root systems except for $F_4$. The root 1121 for $F_4$ is strongly extreme too.

The definition can be modified by imposing one of the following conditions a) $k_{\mathrm{lng}} = k_{\mathrm{sht}}$ , b) $k_{\mathrm{sht}} = 0$, c) $k_{\mathrm{lng}} = 0$. Under either constraint, $\vartheta$ becomes a unique strongly extreme root. The below theorem holds in these cases.

**Theorem 5.3.** *i) Let us assume that $q$ is generic, $|q| < 1$, and*

$$(\rho_k, \alpha^\vee) \notin \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\} \text{ for all } \alpha \in R_+. \tag{5.20}$$

*These conditions result in*

$$(\rho_k\,,\, \alpha^\vee) - k_\alpha \notin \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}$$

*for* $\alpha \in R_+$ *and therefore are sufficient for the right-hand side of (5.18) to exist and be nonzero as well as for the sum in the definition of* $\langle \gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp$. *The latter sum is finite if and only if* $h_\alpha(k) \in -\mathbf{N}$ *for a strongly extreme root* $\alpha$.

*ii) If* $h_\vartheta(k) = -1$ *and (5.20) is satisfied (which automatically holds as* $k_{sht} = k_{lng}$*), the measure* $\mu_\bullet(bw)$ *takes exactly* $|\Pi^\flat|$ *nonzero values. All of them equal* $1$ *and*

$$\langle \gamma\rangle_\sharp \;=\; \sum_{b\in B} q^{(b+\rho_k,b+\rho_k)/2} \;=\; \Big(\sum_{\pi_r\in\Pi^\flat} q^{(\omega_r+\rho_k,\omega_r+\rho_k)/2}\Big)\times$$

$$\prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}\Big), \quad \textit{where}\ \ \omega_0 = 0. \tag{5.21}$$

*In the exceptional case* $\{R = F_4,\ \alpha = 1121,\ h_\alpha(k) = -1\}$, *the number of nonzero values of* $\mu_\bullet(bw)$ *is greater than* $|\Pi| = 1$.

*Proof.* Concerning the first claim, $(\rho_k\,,\,\alpha^\vee) - k_\alpha$ is zero for simple $\alpha = \alpha_i$. If $\alpha$ is not simple, then there exist a simple root $\alpha_i$ of the same length as $\alpha > 0$ such that $\alpha^\vee - \alpha_i^\vee$ is a positive coroot $\beta^\vee$. Then $(\rho_k, \beta^\vee) = (\rho_k\,,\,\alpha^\vee) - k_\alpha$ cannot be from $\mathbf{Z}\setminus\{0\}$ due to (5.20).

There must be at least one root $\alpha$ satisfying $h_\alpha(k) \in -\mathbf{N}$ to make the Jackson sum $\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp \;=\; \sum_{b\in B} q^{(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2}\mu_\bullet(\pi_b)$ finite. Assumption (5.20) gives that at least one such $\alpha$ has to be strongly extreme. By the way, if there are two such roots $\alpha \neq \beta$ (this may happen for $F_4$ only) then $h_\beta(k) - h_\alpha(k) \in \mathbf{Z}$, which contradicts (5.20).

Hence the above sum is finite. Indeed, recall that $\mu_\bullet(\mathrm{id}) \;=\; 1$ and

$$\mu_\bullet(\pi_b) \;=\; \prod\Big(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - t_\alpha^{1/2}q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\rho_k)+j}}{t_\alpha^{1/2} - t_\alpha^{-1/2}q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\rho_k)+j}}\Big)\ \text{ for }\ \alpha\in R_+, \tag{5.22}$$

$$-(b_-,\alpha^\vee) > j > 0\ \text{ if }\ u_b^{-1}(\alpha)\in R_-,\ -(b_-,\alpha^\vee) \ge j > 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

See (5.17) and (3.17).

Let us assume now that $\alpha = \vartheta,\ h_\vartheta(k) = -1$, and $b \neq 0$. The case of $F_4, 1121$ is left to the reader. Then $\mu_\bullet(\pi_b)$ can be nonzero only for $b$ from the $W$-orbits of the minuscule weights $b_- = -\omega_r$. Really, otherwise $-(b_-,\vartheta) \ge 2,\ \ [\vartheta, 1] \in \lambda'(\pi_b),$ and the product (5.22) is zero. Moreover, $u_b^{-1}$ sends the roots $\{\alpha_i^\vee, i \neq r, i > 0\}$ to $R_+^\vee$ since it is minimal such that $u_b^{-1}(\omega_r) = b_-$. Also $u_b^{-1}(-\vartheta) \in R_+^\vee$ to make the product (5.22) nonzero.

However $\{-\vartheta, \alpha_i^\vee, i \neq r, i > 0\}$ form a basis of $R^\vee$. Therefore these conditions determine $u_b^{-1}$ uniquely and it has to coincide with $u_{b_+}^{-1}$. I.e. $b = b_+ = w_0(-b_-) = \omega_{r^*}$, the $\lambda'$-set of $\pi_{b_+} = \pi_{r^*}$ is empty, and $\mu_\bullet(\pi_{r^*}) = 1$. See (2.4).

Thus it suffices to evaluate the Gaussian:

$$((\omega_r)_\sharp, (\omega_r)_\sharp) = (\omega_r - u_r^{-1}(\rho_k)\,,\, \omega_r - u_r^{-1}(\rho_k)) = (\omega_{r^*} + \rho_k\,,\, \omega_{r^*} + \rho_k).$$

□

Another method of proving (5.21) is based on the following symmetrization of (5.18) due to [C5], formula (1.11):

$$\sum_{b_-\in B_-} q^{(b_- -\rho_k\,,\, b_- -\rho_k)/2}\Delta_\bullet(b_-) \;=\; \Big(\sum_{b\in B} q^{(b+\rho_k\,,\, b+\rho_k)/2}\Big)\times \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}\Big), \tag{5.23}$$

$$\Delta_\bullet(b_-) \;=\; \prod\Big(\frac{(t_\alpha^{-1/2} - t_\alpha^{1/2}q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\,\rho_k)+j-1})(1-q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\,\rho_k-b_-)})}{(t_\alpha^{1/2} - t_\alpha^{-1/2}q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\,\rho_k)+j})(1-q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\,\rho_k)})}\Big). \tag{5.24}$$

The latter product is over the set from (5.22) for $b = b_-$, i.e. the relations $-(b_-, \alpha^\vee) \geq j > 0$ for all $\alpha \in R_+$ must hold. In (5.24), only $b_- = -\omega_r$ have nonzero $\Delta_\bullet(b_-)$. So it is sufficient to check that the latter are 1 (which is true). This approach seems to be more convenient for computing explicit formulas when $h_\vartheta(k) = -m,\ m > 1$. They result in generalizations of (5.21 ).

We mention that when $h_\alpha(k) = -m$ for an extreme but not strongly extreme root $\alpha$, then the sum for $\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle_\sharp$ and, equivalently, the sum in (5.23) are not finite. However the corresponding variant of the theorem allows to reduce the summation dramatically.

Also note that the parameter $k_{\text{sht}}$ is free in the case of $B, C, G, F$, provided that it is in a general position. For instance, $\vartheta = \epsilon_1$ for $B_n$ and there is only one constraint $h_\vartheta(k) = 2k_{\text{sht}} + 2(n-1)k_{\text{lng}} = -1$.

The formula (5.21) is one of modifications of the Macdonald identities [M6] closely related to the Kac-Moody algebras (cf. [K],Ch.12). In the last section, we will connect it with one-dimensional representations of $\mathcal{H}^\flat$.

## 6. Semisimple representations

In this section we begin with representations $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$ with the cyclic vector and find out when they are semisimple and pseudo-unitary. The latter means the existence of a nondegenerate hermitian $\star$-invariant form. We add "pseudo" because the involution $*$ acts on constants via the complex conjugation only for $|q| = 1$ and real $k$. Also the form is not supposed to be positive. By definite, we mean a form with nonzero squares of the eigenfunctions with respect to either $X$ or $Y$-operators. So it is a substitute for the positivity. We will give necessary and sufficient conditions for induced modules to possess nonzero semisimple and pseudo-unitary quotients.

It is worth mentioning that the main theorem generalizes the classification of semisimple representations of affine Hecke algebra of type $A$ for generic $t$. See e.g. Section 3 from [C9], references therein, and [Na]. In the $A$-case, the combinatorial part was clarified in full. It is directly related to the classical theory of Young's bases.

There are also partial results for classical root systems in the author's works and recent papers by A.Ram (he also considered some special systems, for instance, $G_2$). Still there is no complete answer. Generally, one can use the classification of all irreducible representations from [KL1]. However checking the semisimplicity is far from immediate.

Actually the importance of semisimple representations is somewhat doubtful from the $p$-adic viewpoint, in spite of interesting combinatorial applications. The reason is that the Bernstein-Zelevinsky operators are not normal with respect to the natural unitary structure which comes from the $p$-adic theory.

The theory of double affine Hecke algebras, especially as $|q| = 1$, does require such representations. In reasonably interesting representations, either $X$-operators or $Y$-operators are normal. The case of $A_{n-1}$ will be considered below.

The notation is from of the previous sections. All $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^b$-modules (the lattice $B$ is fixed) will be defined over the field $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$ or over its extension $\mathbf{Q}_\xi = \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}(q^{\xi_1}, \ldots, q^{\xi_n})$, where $q^{\xi_i} = q^{(b_i,\xi)}$ for a basis $\{b_i\}$ of $B$. Here $q, t, \xi$ can be generic as above or arbitrary complex. In the latter case, $\mathbf{Q}_\xi$ is a proper subfield of $\mathbf{C}$, provided the existence of the involution $*$ on $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t} \subset \mathbf{Q}_\xi$ taking

$$q^{1/2\tilde{m}} \mapsto q^{-1/2\tilde{m}},\ t_\nu^{1/2} \mapsto t_\nu^{-1/2},\ q^{\xi_i} \mapsto q^{-\xi_i}.$$

This involution is extended to the anti-involution (2.16) of $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$. We need several general definitions.

*Eigenvectors.* A vector $v$ satisfying

$$X_a(v) \;=\; q^{(a,\xi)}\, v \;\text{ for }\; \text{all } a \in B. \tag{6.1}$$

is called an $X$-eigenvector of weight $\xi$. We set

$$V^s_X(\xi) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{v \in V \mid (X_a - q^{(a,\xi)})^s(v) = 0 \;\text{ for }\; a \in B\},$$
$$V_X(\xi) \;=\; V^1_X(\xi),\;\; V^\infty_X(\xi) = \cup_{s>0}\, V^s_X(\xi). \tag{6.2}$$

Taking $Y_a$ instead of $X_a$ in (6.1), we define $Y$-eigenvectors of weight $\xi$ and introduce $V^s_Y(\xi)$.

The action of the group $\hat{W}$ on the weights is affine: $\hat{w}(\xi) = \hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)$. See (1.17). The $\hat{W}^\flat$-*stabilizer* of $\xi$ is

$$\hat{W}^\flat[\xi] \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat,\; q^{(\hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)-\xi\,,\,a)} = 1 \;\text{ for }\; \text{all } a \in B\}. \tag{6.3}$$

From now on weights $\xi$ and $\xi'$ will be identified if $q^{(a,\xi'-\xi)} = 1$ for all $a \in B$. We put $q^\xi = q^{\xi'}$ if it is true.

The *category* $\mathcal{O}_X$ is formed by the modules $V$ such that $V = \oplus_\xi V^\infty_X(\xi)$ and the latter spaces are finite-dimensional, where the summation is over different $q^\xi$. This is supposed to hold for a proper extension of the field of constants. In the definition of $\mathcal{O}_Y$, we substitute $Y$ for $X$.

Using the decomposition (2.23) from the PBW-type Theorem 2.1, one can checks that an $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat-$ modules from $\mathcal{O}_X \cap \mathcal{O}_Y$ with finitely many generators are finite-dimensional. Indeed, the space $\tilde{U} = \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[Y_b]U$ is finite-dimensional for any finite-dimensional subspace $U$ of such a module. If $U$ is preserved by the affine Hecke subalgebra $\mathcal{H}^\flat_X$ generated by $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]U$ and $T_i$, $1 \le i \le n$, then $\tilde{U}$ is a finite sum of $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat u$ for proper $u \in U$. Therefore it is an $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat-$ submodule of $V$. Since there are finitely many generators of $V$ we get the required.

In this reasoning, it is not necessary to assume that the spaces $V^\infty_X(\xi)$ and $V^\infty_Y(\xi)$ are finite-dimensional. If we know that $V$ is finitely generated then it is sufficient to use that

$$\oplus_\xi\, V^\infty_X(\xi) \;=\; V = \oplus_\xi V^\infty_Y(\xi).$$

*Intertwiners.* If the $X$-weight of $v$ is $\xi$, then $\Phi_{\hat{w}}v$ is an $X$-eigenvector of weight $\hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)$ for the $X$-intertwiners $\Phi$ from (3.22). Here we can take $S_{\hat{w}}$ or $G_{\hat{w}}$ instead of $\Phi_{\hat{w}}$ (ibid.), because they are proportional to $\Phi_{\hat{w}}$.

The denominators of $\Phi, S$ or $G$ have to be nonzero upon the evaluating at $q^{\xi}$ if the latter is not generic.

Given a reduced decomposition $\hat{w} = \pi_r s_{i_l} \ldots s_{i_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi_{\hat{w}} v = \pi_r \Phi_{i_l}(q^{\xi\{l-1\}}) \cdots \Phi_{i_1}(q^{\xi\{1\}})(v) \\ &\quad \text{for } \ \xi\{0\} = \xi, \ \xi\{j\} = s_{i_p}(\!(\xi\{p-1\})\!), \end{aligned}$$

$$\Phi_i(q^{\xi}) \ = \ T_i + (t_i^{1/2} - t_i^{-1/2})(q^{(\xi+d\,,\alpha_i)} - 1)^{-1}, \ i \geq 0. \tag{6.4}$$

Cf. (3.27) and (3.32).

In the $Y$-case, the $\Phi_i$ becomes $\varepsilon(\Phi_i)$. For instance, $q^{\xi}$ is replaced by $q^{-\xi}$ in the latter formula as $j > 0$ without touching $T, t$. Constructing $\xi\{p\}$ in terms of the initial $Y$-weight $\xi$ remains unchanged. There is another variant of the $Y$-intertwiners, technically more convenient. It has been used in Proposition (3.4). We will use it in the main theorem below. Namely, we can take $\tau_+\big(\Phi_{\hat{w}}(q^{-\xi})\big)$ instead of $\varepsilon(\Phi_{\hat{w}})(q^{\xi})$. These operators intertwine the $Y$-eigenvectors as well. Given $v$ of $Y$-weight $\xi$, $v' = \tau_+\big(\Phi_{\hat{w}}(q^{-\xi})\big)v$ is a $Y$-eigenvectors of weight $\hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)$. Notice the opposite sign of $\xi$ here. Recall that $\tau_+$ can be interpreted as the conjugation by the Gaussian fixing $X$, $T_i (1 \leq i \leq n)$, and the anti-involution $\star$. Explicitly,

$$v' \ = \ \tau\big(\pi_r \Phi_{i_l}(q^{-\xi\{l-1\}}) \cdots \Phi_{i_1}(q^{-\xi\{1\}})\big)(v), \tag{6.5}$$

where the representation (and the notation) from (6.4) is used.

*Induced and semisimple modules.* A $\mathcal{H\!H}^{\flat}$-module $V$ over $\mathbf{Q}_{\xi}$ is called $X$-*cyclic* of weight $\xi$ if it is generated by an element $v \in V$ satisfying (6.1).

The *induced* module generated by $v$ with (6.1) regarded as the defining relations is denoted by $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$. Its weights constitute the orbit $\hat{W}^{\flat}(\xi)$. Respectively, the weights of any cyclic modules of weight $\xi$ belong to this orbit. The map $H \mapsto Hv$ identifies $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ with the affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_Y^{\flat} \subset \mathcal{H\!H}^{\flat}$. Note that the $\xi$-eigenspace $\mathcal{I}(\xi)$ of $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ becomes a subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}_Y^{\flat}$ under this identification.

Similarly, the $Y$-cyclic modules are introduced for $Y_b$ instead of $X_b$ :

$$\mathcal{I}_Y[\xi] \cong \mathcal{H}_X^{\flat} \ = \ \langle X_b, T_i \ \mid \ b \in B, i > 0 \rangle.$$

By $X$-*semisimple*, we mean a $\mathcal{H\!H}^{\flat}$-module $V$ coinciding with $\oplus_{\xi} V_X(\xi)$ over an algebraic closure of the field of constants. Here $\xi$ constitute the set of different $X$-weights of $V$, denoted by $\mathrm{Spec}_X(V)$ and called the $X$-*spectrum.* If $V$ is a cyclic module of weight $\xi$ then the spectrum is defined over the field $\mathbf{Q}_\xi$. Indeed the spectrum of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ is the orbit $W^\flat(\!(\xi)\!)$. The definition of a $Y$-semisimple module is for $Y$ taken instead of $X$.

The functional representation $\mathbf{F}[\xi]$ introduced in Section 4 is $X$-cyclic for generic $\xi$. It is isomorphic to $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi_o]$ for the weight $\xi_o \in \hat{W}(\!(\xi)\!)$, satisfying the inequalities

$$t_\alpha^{-1} X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q_o^\xi) \neq 1 \ \text{ for } \ \tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{R}_+, \tag{6.6}$$

provided that $\hat{W}^\flat[\xi] = \{1\}$. It is proved in [C1] (after Corollary 6.5).

The polynomial representation, which will be denoted by $\mathcal{V}$, is $Y$-cyclic for generic $q,t$. Any $E_b$ can be taken as its cyclic vector. One has $\mathrm{Spec}_Y(\mathcal{V}) = \{b_\sharp \mid b \in B\}$.

*Pseudo-unitary structure.* A quadratic form ( , ) is called respectively $*$-bilinear and *pseudo-hermitian* if

$$(ru, v) \ = \ r(u,v) \ = \ (u, r^* v) \ \text{ for } \ r \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t} \ \text{ and } \ (u,v) \ = \ (v,u)^*.$$

We will always consider nondegenerate forms unless stated otherwise.

A $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-module $V$ is *pseudo-unitary* if it is equipped with a $\star$-*invariant* pseudo-hermitian form:

$$(H(u), v) \ = \ (u, H^\star(v)) \ \text{ for all } u, v \in V, \ H \in \mathcal{HH}^\flat.$$

We call it *definite* if $(v,v) \neq 0$ for all $v$, and $X$-*definite* if $(v,v) \neq 0$ for all $X$-eigenvectors $v \in V$ assuming that the field of constants contain all eigenvalues. By $X$-unitary, we mean $X$-semisimple $V$ with an $X$-definite form. Strictly speaking, they should be called $X$-pseudo-unitary, but we skip “pseudo” in the presence of $X$. The same definitions will be used for $Y$.

We do not suppose $X$-definite or $Y$-definite forms to be positive (or negative) hermitian forms. Note that $X$-unitary $V$ from the category $\mathcal{O}_X$ is $X$-semisimple. Vice versa, pseudo-unitary $X$-semisimple $V$ with the simple $X$-spectrum is $X$-unitary.

When $\mathbf{Q}_\xi \subset \mathbf{C}$, the involution $*$ is the restriction of the complex conjugation, and $(u,u) > 0$ for all $0 \neq u \in V$, then we call the form positive unitary without adding “pseudo”, $X$, or $Y$.

Any irreducible $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-quotients $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi] \to V$ can be defined over $\mathbf{C}$ assuming that $|q| = 1, k_\alpha \in \mathbf{R}, \xi \in \mathbf{R}^n$ in the following sense. We claim that there is a continuous deformation of any triple $q, k, \xi$ to such a triple, which preserves the structure of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$, including quotients, submodules, semisimplicity, and the pseudo-hermitian invariant form.

This simply means that the variety of all triples $\{q, k, \xi\}$ has points satisfying the above reality conditions. Thus $*$ can be assumed to be a restriction of the complex conjugation to the field of constants upon such deformation.

*Semisimple range.* Given a weight $\xi$, its *plus-range* $\Upsilon_+[\xi]$ is the set of all elements $\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat$ satisfying the following condition

$$\tilde{\alpha} = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j] \in \lambda(\hat{w}) \ \Rightarrow\ t_\alpha X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^\xi) = q^{(\alpha\,,\xi)+\nu_\alpha(k_\alpha+j)} \neq 1. \tag{6.7}$$

We put $\hat{u} \mapsto \hat{w}$ if a) either $\hat{w} = s_i\hat{u}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$ provided that $l(\hat{w}) = l(\hat{u}) + 1$ or b) $\hat{w} = \pi_r\hat{u}$ for $\pi_r \in \Pi^\flat$. The *boundary* $\ddot{\Upsilon}_+[\xi]$ of $\Upsilon_+[\xi]$ is by definition the set of all $\hat{w} \notin \Upsilon_+[\xi]$ such that $\hat{u} \mapsto \hat{w}$ for an element $\hat{u} \in \Upsilon_+[\xi]$. It may happen in case a) only. The condition $l(\hat{w}) = l(\hat{u}) + 1$ will be fulfilled automatically once $\hat{w} = s_i\hat{u}$.

The *minus-range* $\Upsilon_-(\xi)$ is defined for $t_\alpha^{-1}$ in place of $t_\alpha$. The *semisimple range* $\Upsilon_*[\xi]$ is the intersection $\Upsilon_+[\xi] \cap \Upsilon_-[\xi]$. The *zero-range* $\Upsilon_0[\xi]$ is introduced for $t_\alpha^0 = 1$, i.e. without $t_\alpha$ in (6.7). The boundaries are defined respectively. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Upsilon_-[\xi] = \Upsilon_+[-\xi],\ \Upsilon_0[\xi] = \Upsilon_0[-\xi],\\ &\ddot{\Upsilon}_*[\xi] \subset \ddot{\Upsilon}_+[\xi] \cup \ddot{\Upsilon}_-[\xi]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

We will use the compatibility of the semisimple and zero ranges with the right multiplications. Namely,

$$\Upsilon_*[\hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)] \ =\ \Upsilon_*[\xi]\,\hat{w}^{-1} \text{ for every } \hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]. \tag{6.9}$$

It readily results from (1.11). The same holds for $\Upsilon_0$ (but, generally speaking, not for $\Upsilon_\pm$).

*Semisimple stabilizer.* The following *semisimple stabilizer* of $\xi$

$$\hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi] \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat[\xi] \mid \hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]\} \ =\ \hat{W}^\flat_*[-\xi]. \tag{6.10}$$

will play an important role in the main theorem of this section. It is a subgroup of $\hat{W}^\flat[\xi]$. Indeed, if $\hat{u}, \hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi]$, then the set $\lambda(\hat{u}) \cup \hat{u}^{-1}(\lambda(\hat{w}))$ satisfies (6.7) and the corresponding relation for $\Upsilon_-[\xi]$ because $\hat{u}$ does not change $q^\xi$. The set $\Upsilon_-[\xi]$ contains $\lambda(\hat{w}\hat{u})$ even if $l(\hat{w}\hat{u}) < l(\hat{w}) + l(\hat{u})$. Apply (1.11) to the product of the reduced decompositions of $\hat{w}$ and $\hat{u}$, which may be nonreduced, to see it.

Moreover, this very argument gives that

$$\Upsilon_*[\xi]\hat{w} = \Upsilon_*[\xi] \text{ for every } \hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi] \text{ and} \tag{6.11}$$

$$\hat{W}^\flat_*[\hat{w}((\xi))] = \hat{w}\,\hat{W}^\flat_*[\hat{w}\xi]\,\hat{w}^{-1} \text{ for all } \hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]. \tag{6.12}$$

The last property is directly connected with (6.9).

Similarly, one can introduce the groups $\hat{W}^\flat_\pm[\xi]$ and $\hat{W}^\flat_0[\xi]$. They preserve the corresponding $\Upsilon[\xi]$ acting via the right multiplication.

*Sharp case.* When considering spherical and self-dual representations, the *sharp range* $\Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$ will be used, which is simply $\Upsilon_+[\xi]$ as $\xi = -\rho_k$, and other $\Upsilon$ for such $\xi$.

Recall that by $c \leftrightarrow\!\!\rightarrow b$, we mean that $b \in B$ can be obtained from $c \in B$ by a chain of transformations i),ii),iii) (the simple arrows) from Proposition 1.6. Here $c \leftrightarrow$ indicates that transformations of type iii) may be involved. The latter correspond to the applications of $\pi_r \in \Pi^\flat$ and are invertible. Otherwise we put $c \rightarrow\!\!\rightarrow b$.

This usage of arrows is actually a particular case of the $\hat{u} \mapsto \hat{w}$ upon the restriction to $\Upsilon_+(-\rho_k)$. Indeed, the latter is the set of all $\hat{w} = \pi_b$ satisfying (6.7). If $\pi_c \in \Upsilon_+(-\rho_k)$ and $c \rightarrow b$ corresponds to $\pi_b = s_i\pi_c$, then $\pi_b \in \Upsilon_+(-\rho_k)$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} &t_\alpha q^{(\alpha\,,\,c_- - \rho_k)} \neq 1 \ \text{ for } \ i > 0,\ \alpha = u_c(\alpha_i),\\ &t_\alpha q^{1+(\alpha\,,\,c_- - \rho_k)} \neq 1 \ \text{ for } \ i = 0,\ \alpha = u_c(-\vartheta). \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

Using $c_\sharp = c - u_c^{-1}(\rho_k) = u_c^{-1}(-\rho_k + c_-)$ and $([\alpha, j]\,,\, d) = j$,

$$t_\alpha q^{(\alpha_i\,,\,c_\sharp + d)} \neq 1 \ \text{ for } \ i \geq 0. \tag{6.14}$$

If $c \leftrightarrow b$, i.e. $\pi_b = \pi_r\pi_c$ for $\pi_r \in \Pi^\flat$, then always $\pi_b \in \Upsilon_+(-\rho_k)$.

**Main Theorem.** We turn to a general description of semisimple and pseudo-unitary representations. It will be reduced to a certain combinatorial problem which can be managed in several cases. We permanently identify the cyclic generator $v \in \mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ with $1 \in \mathcal{H}^\flat_Y$, which can be uniquely extended to a $\mathcal{H}^\flat_Y$-isomorphism $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi] \cong \mathcal{H}^\flat_Y$.

**Theorem 6.1.** *i) Assuming that*

$$\Upsilon_*[\xi] \subset \Upsilon_0[\xi] \ \ \textit{and} \ \ \mathcal{J}_\xi \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum \mathcal{H}_Y \Phi_{\hat{w}}(q^\xi) \neq \mathcal{H}_Y, \tag{6.15}$$

*where the summation is over* $\hat{w} \in \ddot{\Upsilon}_*[\xi]$*, the quotient* $U = U_X^{\xi} \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathcal{H}_Y^{\flat}/\mathcal{J}_{\xi}$ *is an* $X$*-semisimple* $\mathcal{HH}^{\flat}$*-module with a basis of* $X$*-eigenvectors* $\{\Phi_{\hat{w}}(q^{\xi})\}$ *for* $\hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$*. Its* $X$*-spectrum is* $\{\hat{w}(\xi)\}$ *for such* $\hat{w}$*.*

*If* $V$ *is an irreducible* $X$*-semisimple* $\mathcal{HH}^{\flat}$*-module with a cyclic vector of weight* $\xi$ *then (6.15) holds and* $V$ *is a quotient of* $U$*, provided that* $t_{sht} \neq 1 \neq t_{lng}$*.*

*ii) The elements* $\Phi_{\hat{w}}v'$*,* $S_{\hat{w}}v'$*,* $G_{\hat{w}}v'$ *are well defined for all* $v'$ *from the* $\xi$*-eigenspace* $U(\xi)$ *of* $U$ *and* $\hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$*. They induce isomorphisms* $U(\xi) \cong U(\hat{w}(\xi))$*.*

*The group* $\hat{W}_*^{\flat}[\xi]$ *acts in* $U(\xi)$ *by automorphisms via* $\hat{w} \mapsto S_{\hat{w}}$*. A quotient* $V$ *of* $U$ *is an irreducible* $\mathcal{HH}^{\flat}$*-module if and only if* $V(\xi)$ *is an irreducible* $\hat{W}_*^{\flat}[\xi]$*-module. Moreover, provided (6.15), an arbitrary irreducible representation* $V'$ *of this group can be uniquely extended to an irreducible* $X$*-semisimple* $\mathcal{HH}^{\flat}$*-quotient* $V$ *of* $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ *such that* $V' = V(\xi)$*. Here* $G$ *can be used instead of* $S$*.*

*The above statements hold for* $\mathcal{I}_Y[\xi]$ *and its semisimple quotients when* $\Phi_{\hat{w}}(q^{\xi})$ *are replaced by* $\tau_+\big(\Phi_{\hat{w}}(q^{-\xi})\big)$ *everywhere.*

*iii) Under the same constraint (6.15), the function*

$$\mu_\bullet(\hat{w}) \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \prod_{[\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\lambda(\hat{w})} \Big(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{1/2} X_\alpha(q^{\xi})}{t_\alpha^{1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{-1/2} X_\alpha(q^{\xi})}\Big) \tag{6.16}$$

*has neither poles nor zeros at* $\hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$*. Moreover,*

$$\mu_\bullet(\hat{u})\mu_\bullet(\hat{w}) \ = \ \mu_\bullet(\hat{u}\hat{w}) \ \textit{whenever}\ \hat{w} \in \hat{W}_*^{\flat}[\xi] \tag{6.17}$$

*for* $\hat{u}, \hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$*,*

*A* $\mathcal{HH}^{\flat}$*-quotient* $V$ *of* $U$ *is pseudo-unitary if and only if the eigenspace* $V(\xi)$ *is a pseudo-unitary* $\hat{W}_*^{\flat}[\xi]$*-module. The latter means that the form* $(\ ,\ )$ *is nondegenerate on* $V(\xi)$ *and*

$$(S_{\hat{w}}^{\xi})^{\star}\, S_{\hat{w}}^{\xi} = \mu_\bullet(\hat{w}) \ \ \textit{for} \ \ \hat{w} \in \hat{W}_*^{\flat}[\xi],\ S_{\hat{w}}^{\xi} \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} S_{\hat{w}}(q^{\xi}). \tag{6.18}$$

*iv) A pseudo-hermitian form on* $e', e'' \in V(\xi)$*, can be uniquely extended to an pseudo-hermitian invariant form on* $V$ *:*

$$(S_{\hat{u}}e'\,,\, S_{\hat{w}}e'') \ = \ \delta'_{\hat{u},\hat{w}}\, \mu_\bullet(\hat{u})\, (e'\,,\, S_{\hat{u}^{-1}\hat{w}}e''), \quad \textit{where} \tag{6.19}$$

$$\hat{u}, \hat{v} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi],\ \delta'_{\hat{u},\hat{w}} = 1 \ \ \textit{for} \ \ \hat{u}^{-1}\hat{w} \in \hat{W}_*^{\flat}[\xi] \ \ \textit{and} \ \ = 0 \ \textit{otherwise}.$$

*If* $(e', e') \neq 0$ *as* $V(\xi) \ni e' \neq 0$ *then* $V$ *is* $X$*-unitary.*

*An arbitrary irreducible pseudo-unitary ($X$-unitary) $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-module with a cyclic vector of weight $\xi$ can be obtained by this construction as $t_{sht} \neq 1 \neq t_{lng}$.*

*In the $Y$-case,*

$$\tilde{G}^{\xi}_{\hat w} \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \tau_+\bigl(G_{\hat w}(q^{-\xi})\bigr)$$

*is taken instead of $S_{\hat w}(q^{\xi})$; these operators send $V(\xi)$ to $V(\hat w(\!(\xi)\!))$. The extension from a pseudo-hermitian form on $V(\xi)$ is*

$$(\tilde{G}^{\xi}_{\hat u} e' \,,\, \tilde{G}^{\xi}_{\hat w} e'') \;=\; \delta'_{\hat u,\hat w}\, \mu_\bullet(\hat u)^{-1}\, (e' \,,\, \tilde{G}^{\xi}_{\hat u^{-1}\hat w} e''). \tag{6.20}$$

*Proof.* We set $e_{\hat w} = \Phi_{\hat w}(1)$ for $\hat w \in \hat W^\flat$ provided that $\Phi_{\hat w}(1)$ is well defined. It is an $X$-eigenvector of weight $\hat w(\xi)$. Recall that we permanently identify $v$ and 1. Then $\mathcal{H}_Y e_{\hat w}$ is a $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-submodule because $\mathcal{HH}^\flat = \mathcal{H}_Y \cdot \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]$.

Assuming (6.15), $\mathcal{J}_\xi$ and $U$ are $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-modules. Moreover, all $e_{\hat w}$ are invertible in $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ and their images linearly generate $U$ as $\hat w \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$. Indeed, if $\Phi_i e_{\hat w}$ loses the invertibility then $s_i\hat w$ leaves $\Upsilon_*[\xi]$, $l(s_i\hat w) = l(\hat w)+1$, and $s_i\hat w \in \ddot{\Upsilon}_*[\xi]$. By (6.15), $\ddot{\Upsilon}_*[\xi] \subset \Upsilon_0[\xi]$. We conclude that the element $T_i(e_{\hat w})$ is proportional to $e_{\hat w}$ in this case.

This means that each $T_i(e_{\hat w})$ is a linear combination of $e_{\hat u}$ for any $n \geq i \geq 0$, where $\hat w, \hat u \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$. Of course it holds for $\pi_r \in \Pi^\flat$ too. Thus $\{e_{\hat w'}\}$ linearly generate $U$. Moreover, given $\hat w \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$, the map $v' \mapsto \Phi_{\hat w} v'$ induces an isomorphism $U(\xi) \cong U(\hat w(\xi))$.

Summarizing, (6.15) implies that $\{e_{\hat w \hat u}\}$ form a basis of $U$ when
(a) $\hat w$ are representatives of all classes $\Upsilon_*[\xi]/\hat W^\flat[\xi]$,
(b) $\hat u \in \hat W^\flat[\xi]$ and $\{e_{\hat u}\}$ form a basis of $U(\xi)$.

Let us discuss the usage of $S$ and $G$. The elements $S_{\hat w}(1) \in \mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ are well defined and for $\hat w \in \Upsilon_+[\xi]$. The sum $\mathcal{J}_\xi^+ \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum \mathcal{H}_Y S_{\hat w}$ , $\hat w \in \ddot{\Upsilon}_+[\xi]$, is a $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-submodule of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$. Finally, $S_{\hat w}(1)$ are invertible for $\hat w \in \Upsilon_*[\xi]$, which results directly from the definition of the latter set. The same holds for $\Upsilon_-[\xi]$ with $S$ being replaced by $G$. Turning to $\mathcal{I}_Y[\xi]$, $G$ and $S$ serve respectively $\Upsilon_+[\xi]$ and $\Upsilon_-[\xi]$.

Now let us check that the existence of irreducible $X$-semisimple quotients $V \neq \{0\}$ of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ implies (6.15), and all such $V$ are quotients of $U$. We suppose that $t_{\mathrm{sht}} \neq 1 \neq t_{\mathrm{lng}}$. Actually we will impose $t_{\mathrm{sht}} \neq \pm 1 \neq t_{\mathrm{lng}}$ in the argument below, leaving the consideration of

$t=-1$ to the reader. This allows separating $T_i-t_i^{1/2}$ and $T_i+t_i^{-1}$. When $t_i=-1$ the $T_i$ is not semisimple, but the theorem still holds in this case.

The images $e_{\hat{w}}$ of the vectors $\Phi_{\hat{w}}(1)$ in $V$ are nonzero as $\hat{w}\in\Upsilon_*[\xi]$. If $\Upsilon_0[\xi]\not\supset\Upsilon_*[\xi]$, we can pick $e'=e_{\hat{w}}$ such that $S_i(e')=e'$ and $X_{\alpha_i}(e')=e'$. This gives that $X_{\alpha_i}$ is not semisimple in the two-dimensional module generated by $e'$ and $e''=T_i(e')$. The dimension is two because the characters of $\mathcal{H}_X^i\overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=}\langle T_i,X_{\alpha_i}\rangle$ send $X_{\alpha_i}\mapsto t_i^{\pm}\neq 1$. So it cannot be one.

Now let $\hat{u}$ belong to $\Upsilon_*[\xi]$ and $\hat{w}=s_i\hat{u}\in\ddot{\Upsilon}_+[\xi]$. The case $\hat{w}=s_i\hat{u}\in\ddot{\Upsilon}_-[\xi]$ is completely analogous. We will skip it. Then $l(\hat{w})=l(\hat{u})+1$. Both $e'=\Phi_{\hat{u}}(e)$ and $e''=\Phi_i(e')=(T_i-t_i^{1/2})(e')$ are $X$-eigenvectors. Here by $e$, we mean the image of 1 in $V$. Let us prove that $e''=0$.

Supposing that $e''\neq 0$, it cannot be proportional to $e'$. Indeed, this may only happen if $(T_i+t_i^{-1/2})(e')=0$, which is impossible since $\hat{u}\in\Upsilon_*[\xi]\subset\Upsilon_-[\xi]$.

We note that if $V$ is $X$-unitary, then restricting the $X$-definite form to the linear span of $e',e''$ readily leads to a contradiction with the relation $T_i^\star=T_i^{-1}$. This argument doesn't require the irreducibility of $V$, but involves the $X$-unitary structure.

If $e''\neq 0$ then it generates $V$ as a $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$-module and as a $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$-module thanks to the irreducibility. This means that

$$\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat(T_i-t_i^{1/2})\Phi_{\hat{w}}(1)+J_V=\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat,\ \text{ where }\ V=\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat/J_V,$$

for a proper ideal $J_V\subset\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ which is a $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$-submodule of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$. Hence, $J_V$ contains $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat(T_i+t_i^{-1/2})\Phi_{\hat{w}}(1)$ and $e''$ has to be proportional $e'$. This is impossible because $X_{\alpha_i}(e'')=t_i^{-1}$ whereas $X_{\alpha_i}(e')\neq t_i^{\pm 1}$.

Summarizing, we almost completed parts i),ii) from the theorem. The remaining claims are

a) the equivalence of the irreducibility of the $\mathcal{H\!\!H}^\flat$-module $V$ and the $\hat{W}_*^\flat[\xi]$-module $V(\xi)$,

b) the possibility of taking an arbitrary irreducible representation of $\hat{W}_*^\flat[\xi]$ as $V(\xi)$.

Applying the intertwining operators, both claims readily follow from the statements which have been checked.

Let us turn to iii),iv). We take $e',e''\in V(\xi)$ and denote $e'_{\hat{w}}=S_{\hat{w}}e'$ and $e''_{\hat{w}}=S_{\hat{w}}e''$, where $\hat{w}\in\Upsilon_*[\xi]$, for a certain pseudo-unitary irreducible quotient $V$ of $\mathcal{I}_X^\flat$. They are nonzero $X$-eigenvectors. If the eigenvalues of $e'_{\hat u}$ and $e''_{\hat w}$ are different, i.e. $\hat u^{-1}\hat w \not\in \hat W^\flat_*[\xi]$, then these vectors are orthogonal with respect to the invariant form of $V$.

Applying (3.26),

$$(e'_{\hat w}\,,\, e''_{\hat w}) \;=\; (S_{\hat w}e'\,,\, S_{\hat w}e'') \;=\; (S^\star_{\hat w}\, S_{\hat w}e'\,,\, e'') \;= \tag{6.21}$$

$$(e', e'')\prod_{\alpha,j}\Bigl(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{1/2} X_\alpha(q^\xi)}{t_\alpha^{1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{-1/2} X_\alpha(q^\xi)}\Bigr),\ [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j]\in\lambda(\hat w).$$

The latter product is nothing else but $\mu_\bullet(\hat w)$ from (6.16). Thus the extension of ( , ) from $V(\xi)$ to $V$ is unique if it exists. Explicitly:

$$(S_{\hat u}e'\,,\, S_{\hat w}e'') = \delta'_{\hat u,\hat w}\,\mu_\bullet(\hat u)\,(e'\,,\, S_{\hat u^{-1}\hat w}e''),\quad \text{where}\ \ e', e''\in V(\xi), \tag{6.22}$$

$$\hat u, \hat v\in \Upsilon_*[\xi],\quad \delta'_{\hat u,\hat w} = 1\ \ \text{for}\ \ \hat u^{-1}\hat w\in \hat W^\flat_*[\xi]\ \ \text{and}\ \ 0\ \text{otherwise}.$$

To check that this formula extends correctly an arbitrary given definite form on $V(\xi)$, it suffices to compare

$$(S_{\hat w}e''\,,\, S_{\hat u}e')^*\ \ \text{and}\ \ (S_{\hat u\hat v}(S_{\hat v}^{-1}e')\,,\, S_{\hat w}e'')$$

and to show that they coincide whenever $\hat v\in \hat W^\flat_*[\xi]$. Using (6.22), we need the relations

$$\mu_\bullet(\hat w^{-1}\hat u)\mu_\bullet(\hat w) = \mu_\bullet(\hat u),\ \mu_\bullet(\hat u\hat v)\mu_\bullet(\hat v^{-1}) = \mu_\bullet(\hat u),$$

which are nothing else but (6.17). Claim iv) is verified.

Relation (6.17) obviously holds when $l(\hat u\hat w) = l(\hat u) + l(\hat w)$, because the $\mu_\bullet$-product for $\hat u\hat w$ is taken over $\lambda(\hat u\hat w)$, which is a union of $\lambda(\hat w)$ and the set $\hat w^{-1}(\lambda(\hat u))$. The $\mu_\bullet$-product over the latter set coincides with the product over $\lambda(\hat u)$).

Thanks to (1.11), we can omit the constraint $l(\hat u\hat w) = l(\hat u) + l(\hat w)$ in this argument. Indeed, the extra positive affine roots $\tilde\alpha = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j]\in \tilde\lambda^+(\hat u\hat w)$ appear in $\tilde\lambda(\hat u\hat w)$ together with $-\tilde\lambda\in -\tilde\lambda^+(\hat u\hat w)$. Here we take the product of the reduced decompositions of $\hat u$ and $\hat w$, which may be nonreduced, to construct $\tilde\lambda(\hat u\hat w)$. However the product of the $\mu_\bullet$-factors corresponding to $\tilde\alpha = [\alpha, \nu_\alpha j]$ and $-\tilde\alpha$ is

$$\Bigl(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{1/2} X_\alpha(q^\xi)}{t_\alpha^{1/2} - q_\alpha^j t_\alpha^{-1/2} X_\alpha(q^\xi)}\Bigr)\Bigl(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - q_\alpha^{-j} t_\alpha^{1/2} X_\alpha^{-1}(q^\xi)}{t_\alpha^{1/2} - q_\alpha^{-j} t_\alpha^{-1/2} X_\alpha^{-1}(q^\xi)}\Bigr) \;=\; 1.$$

This concludes iii) and the proof of the theorem. □

Thanks to Proposition 1.3, there is a reasonably simple and explicit combinatorial reformulation of the first part of the condition (6.15). However it doesn't guarantee the second part.

**Proposition 6.2.** *The relation* $\Upsilon_*[\xi] \subset \Upsilon_0[\xi]$ *is equivalent to the following property of* $\xi$. *Let* $\ddot{\Upsilon} = \{\tilde{\beta} = [\beta, \nu_\beta j]\}$ *be the set of all affine positive roots such that* $t_\beta^{\pm 1} X_{\tilde{\beta}}(q^\xi) = 1$. *Then an arbitrary positive affine* $\tilde{\gamma} = [\gamma, \nu_\gamma i]$ *such that* $X_{\tilde{\gamma}}(q^\xi) = 1$ *is a linear combination of some* $\tilde{\beta} \in \ddot{\Upsilon}$ *with positive rational (not always integral) coefficients. Using the closure* $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_a$ *of the affine Weil chamber* $\mathfrak{C}_a$ *from Section 1,*

$$\cup_{\hat{w}}\, \hat{w}(\!(-\bar{\mathfrak{C}}_a)\!) = \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n,\ (z, \beta) + j < 0\} \ \textit{ for } \ \hat{w} \in \Upsilon_*[\xi],\ \tilde{\beta} \in \ddot{\Upsilon}. \tag{6.23}$$

$\square$

*Generic cyclic representations.* We will start the discussion of the theorem with the irreducible $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$. Following [C1], Theorem 6.1, let us assume that $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi]$ is conjugated in $\hat{W}$ to the span of a proper subset of $\{s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$, maybe $\emptyset$ but smaller than the whole set of affine simple reflections. It is possible only if $q$ is not a root of unity, because otherwise $\hat{W}_*[\xi]$ is infinite. By the way, this constraint results in the implication

$$\Upsilon_*[\xi] \subset \Upsilon_0[\xi] \Rightarrow \mathcal{J}_\xi = \sum \mathcal{H}_Y \Phi_{\hat{w}} \neq \mathcal{H}_Y, \ \text{ where } \ \hat{w} \in \ddot{\Upsilon}_*[\xi].$$

We do not prove/use this claim in the paper.

Apart from roots of unity, $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ is irreducible if and only if $\Upsilon_+[\xi] = \hat{W}^\flat = \Upsilon_-[\xi]$. Thus its semisimplicity is equivalent to the triviality of the stabilizer $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi]$.

The theorem can be applied to a general description of the finite-dimensignal semisimple representations. We continue to suppose that $q$ is generic.

**Proposition 6.3.** *i) Under condition (6.15), the induced module* $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ *has a nonzero finite-dimensional* $X$*-semisimple quotient if and only if there exists a set of roots* $T \subset R$ *such that for any* $b \in B$ *there exist* $\beta \in T$ *with* $(b, \beta) > 0$, *i.e.* $\beta$ *do not belong to any halfplane in* $\mathbf{R}^n$, *and for every* $\beta \in T$,

$$(\xi, \beta^\vee) + k_\beta \in -1 - \mathbf{Z}_+ \ \textit{ or } (\xi, \beta^\vee) - k_\beta \in -1 - \mathbf{Z}_+ \ \textit{ for } \ \beta < 0,$$
$$(\xi, \beta^\vee) + k_\beta \in -\mathbf{Z}_+ \ \textit{ or } (\xi, \beta^\vee) - k_\beta \in -\mathbf{Z}_+ \ \textit{ for } \ \beta > 0. \tag{6.24}$$

*Proof.* Let us assume that for all $\alpha \in R$ such that $(b,\alpha) > 0$, either $(\xi,\alpha^\vee) \pm k_\alpha \not\in -1-\mathbf{Z}_+$ for both signs of $k_\alpha$ as $\alpha < 0$ or the same inequalities hold with $-\mathbf{Z}_+$ as $\alpha > 0$. Then $\lambda(lb)$ for $l \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ consists of $\tilde{\alpha} = [\alpha, \nu_\beta j]$ for such $\alpha$ with integers $j$ satisfying inequalities $0 < j \le l(b,\alpha^\vee)$ as $\alpha < 0$ and with $0 \le j$ otherwise. We take $b$ from $\Upsilon_*[\xi]$, so all these $\tilde{\alpha}$ satisfy (6.7) and its counterpart with $t_\alpha^{-1}$ instead of $t_\alpha$. Since $l$ is arbitrary positive, we get that $\Upsilon_*[\xi]$ is infinite if the relations (6.24) don't hold.

Let us check that this condition guarantees that $\Upsilon_*[\xi]$ is finite.

In the first place, any given infinite sequence of pairwise distinct $b^i \in B$ is a (finite) union of subsequences $\{\tilde{b}^i\}$ such that there exist $\beta_\pm \in T$ satisfying $\pm(\tilde{b}^i,\beta_\pm) > 0$. Taking one such infinite subsequence, we may assume that there exist $\beta_\pm \in T$ such that $\pm(b^i,\beta_\pm) > 0$. If the latter scalar products are bounded, we switch to a new sequence $b^i$ formed by proper differences of the old $\{b^i\}$ ensuring that all $(b^i,\beta_\pm) = 0$. Then we find the next pair $\beta_\pm{}'$ such that $\pm(b^i,\beta_\pm{}') > 0$, form the next sequence of differences, and so on until all $T$ is exausted.

We conclude that any sequence $\{b^i\}$ is a union of subsequencies $\{\tilde{b}^i\}$ such that $|(\tilde{b}^i,\beta)| \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$ for certain $\beta \in T$. Following the proof of Proposition 1.4 (see (1.23), (1.24)), given $w \in W$, the sets $\lambda(w\tilde{b}^i)$ contain the roots $[\beta, j\nu_\beta]$ where $\max\{j\} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$.

Note that the proof gets more transparent via the geometric interpretation from Proposition 1.3. ☐

The generalized Macdonald identities correspond to the set $T = \{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n,-\vartheta\}$ taken together with $\xi = -\rho_k$. The sign of $k_\beta$ in the relations (6.24) from the Proposition is plus for $\vartheta$ and minus otherwise. See the end of Section 8.

The constraint (6.15) will be fulfilled, for instance, if $(\xi,\alpha^\vee) \not\in \mathbf{Z}$ for all $\alpha \in R$. The simplest example is as follows. Letting $k_{\text{lng}} = k = k_{\text{sht}}$, $\xi = -k\rho$, we take $k = -m/h$ for the Coxeter number $h$ provided that $(m,h) = 1$. This representation is spherical. In the $A_n$ case, one can follow [C9] to describe all irreducible representations under consideration (for generic $q$).

$GL_n$ **and other applications.** Let us give a description of the $X$-semisimple and general representations for the double Hecke algebra associated to $GL_n$ :

$$\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}_n \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \langle X_1^{\pm 1},\cdots,X_n^{\pm 1},\pi,T_1,\cdots,T_{n-1}\rangle, \quad \text{where} \tag{6.25}$$

(i) $\pi X_i = X_{i+1}\pi$ $(i=1,\dots n-1)$ and $\pi^n X_i = q^{-1}X_i\pi^n$ $(i=1,\dots,n)$,
(ii) $\pi T_i = T_{i+1}\pi$ $(\,i=1,\dots n-2)$ and $\pi^n T_i = T_i\pi^n$ $(i=1,\dots,n-1)$,
(iii)$X_iX_j = X_jX_i$ $(1\le i,j\le n),\ \ T_iX_iT_i = X_{i+1},\ i<n$,
(iv) $T_iT_{i+1}T_i = T_{i+1}T_iT_{i+1},\ T_iT_j = T_jT_i$ as $i<n-1\ge j,\ |i-j|>1$,
(v) $(T_i - t^{1/2})(T_i + t^{-1/2}) = 0$ for $T_1,\dots,T_{n-1},\ \ t=q^k$.

Switching here from $\mathbf{C}[X_i^{\pm 1}]$ to the subalgebra $\mathbf{C}[X_iX_j^{-1}]$ of Laurent polynomials of degree zero, we come to the double Hecke algebra $\mathcal{HH}_n^o$ of type $A_{n-1}$, i.e. that for $SL_n$. To be more exact, we must also set $\pi^n = 1$, which is possible because $\pi^n$ becomes central thanks to (i,ii), and in this definition the root lattice $Q$ is used for $X$ in place of the whole weight lattice $P$.

Later on we will assume that $\pi$ is invertible and identify the representations under the automorphisms $\pi\mapsto c\pi$ of $\mathcal{HH}_n$ for $c\in\mathbf{C}^*$.

The following construction is a "cylindrical" counterpart of that from Section 3 from [C9] (see also [Na]) and generalizes the corresponding affine classification due to Bernstein and Zelevinsky. It is a direct application of the Main Theorem. We will publish the details elsewhere.

Let $\Delta = \{\delta^1,\cdots,\delta^m\}$ be a set of skew Young diagrams without empty rows of the total degree $n$ (i.e. with $n$ boxes in their union), $C=\{c_1,\cdots,c_m\}$ a set of complex numbers such that $q^{c_a-c_b}\not\in t^{\mathbf{Z}}q^{\mathbf{Z}}$ as $a\ne b$.

We number the boxes of these diagrams in the *inverse order*, i.e. from the last box of the last row of $\delta^m$ through the first box of the first row of $\delta^1$, and set

$$\xi_l \ = \ c_{p_l} + k(i_l - j_l),\ l=1,\dots,n,$$

where $\delta^{p_l}$ contains box $l$ $(p_1 = m,\dots,p_n = 1)$, and $i_l, j_l$ are the row and column numbers of the $l$-th box in the corresponding diagram. We say that $\xi$ is associated with the *pair* $\{\Delta, C\}$.

Concerning skew diagrams, if box $l$ belongs to the $i$-th row of the $p$-th diagram (so $i_l = s, p_l = p$) then $m_i < j_l \le n_i$ for the "endpoints" $m_i\le n_i$ of the rows (if they coincide the row is empty) satisfying the inequalities

$$m_i\ge m_{i+1},\ n_i\ge n_{i+1},\ 1\le i< (\text{ number of rows in } \delta_p). \tag{6.26}$$

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let $q^it^j\ne 1$ for any $(i,j)\in\mathbf{Z}^2\setminus(0,0)$. Then condition (6.15) is satisfied if $\xi$ is associated with a $\Delta$-set of skew diagrams and the corresponding $C$-set of complex numbers. The quotient $U=U_X^\xi$ from the Main Theorem is irreducible and $X$-unitary for such*

*$\xi$. Its $X$-spectrum is simple. An arbitrary irreducible $X$-semisimple $\mathcal{HH}_n$-module can be constructed in this way for a proper pair $\{\Delta, C\}$. Isomorphic modules correspond to the pairs which can be obtained from each other by a permutation of the skew diagrams in $\Delta$ together with the corresponding numbers in $C$, and by adding arbitrary integers to the c-numbers.*

*Proof.* See [C1]. □

Note that the weight $\xi$ from the theorem can be used to construct an irreducible representation of the affine Hecke algebra

$$\mathcal{H}_n \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \langle X_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, X_n^{\pm 1}, T_1, \ldots, T_{n-1}\rangle.$$

Cf. [C1] and [C9]. Inducing this module from $\mathcal{H}_n$ to $\mathcal{HH}_n$, we get $U_X^{\xi}$. The same holds for the subalgebra $\mathcal{H}_n^o$ of $\mathcal{H}_n$ with $\mathbf{C}[X_i X_j^{-1}]$ instead of $\mathbf{C}[X_i^{\pm 1}]$ and for the natural restriction of $\xi$ to $\mathbf{C}[X_i X_j^{-1}]$.

*Periodic diagrams.* Assuming that $q$ is not a root of unity, let $t^r = q^s$ for integral $r, s$ where $s > 0$ and $(r, s) = 1$. Using $t = q^k$, we get $k = s/r$. Let $r \in \mathbf{Z}_+$. An infinite skew diagram $\delta$ without empty rows is called *$r$-periodic* of degree $n$ if it is invariant with respect to translation by a vector $w = (v, v - r)$ in the $(i, j)$-plane for a positive integer $v$ such that the subdiagram of $\delta$ with the rows $1 \le i \le v$ contains $n$ boxes.

Here we need to fix the first row in the diagram, although the isomorphism classes of the resulting representations will not depend on such choice. The above subdiagram is called the *basic subdiagram.* It is of course skew.

Any skew subdiagram which is the fundamental domian for the action of $\mathbf{Z}w$ on $\delta$ (so it must contain $n$ boxes) is called a *fundamental subdiagram.* It may have empty rows. An example is the basic subdiagram. However there are infinitely many non-basic ones unless $\delta$ is an infinite column.

Similarly, $\delta$ is called $r$-periodic for negative $r$ if it is invariant with respect to $w = (v + r, v)$ and has a fundamental subdiagram with $n$ boxes. The basic diagram is formed by the first $v$ consecutive columns in this case.

*Partitions.* A periodic skew diagram is naturally a portion of the $\{i, j\}$-plane between its *upper-left boundary* (the boundaries of a box are its four sides) and its *lower-right boundary.* The boundaries are by definition continuous curves made from segments where either $i \in \mathbf{Z}$ or $j \in \mathbf{Z}$. They satisfy the skew condition. We will call them *skew paths*.

By an *s-partition* of a skew diagram $\delta$ of degree $n$ we mean its representation as a disjoint union of $s$ skew subdiagrams $\{\delta_0, \cdots, \delta_{s-1}\}$ which are the portions of $\delta$ between consecutive paths from a certain system of skew paths without crossings. The latter means that different paths from such a system may have coinciding subpaths but do not cross each other. We number the paths upwards. We will call such partitions *increasing*.

Note that some of the subdiagrams in the partition can be empty and they may have empty rows.

The subdiagrams in a given partition are *partially ordered* naturally. Namely, $\delta' > \delta''$ if at least one box of $\delta'$ is in the same column and higher than a box from $\delta''$ or is in the same row and to the left of a box from $\delta''$.

Using this definition, increasing skew partitions can be introduced without using the paths as follows. First, it is not allowed that $\delta_a > \delta_b$ and at the same time $\delta_a < \delta_b$ for different $a, b$. Second, $a > b$ if $\delta_a > \delta_b$.

For instance, the representation of a skew diagram $\delta$ of degree $n$ as a union of all its boxes counted from the last box in the last row through the first box in the first row (i.e. with respect to the inverse order) is an increasing $n$-partition. However there are different increasing orderings of these boxes unless $\delta$ is a column or a row.

We will need the partitions of the fundamental subdiagrams. They appear naturally when decomposing semisimple representations of $\mathcal{HH}_n$ under the action of $\mathcal{H}_n$.

*New pairs.* Extending these definitions to $\Delta$, we call it $r$-periodic of degree $n$ if all $\delta^p$ are $r$-periodic and the total degree of $\{\delta^p\}$ is $n$. The weights $\xi$ associated with a *new pair* $\{\Delta, C\}$ are those for *any* choice of fundamental subdiagrams of $\{\tilde{\delta}^p\}$ calculated using the formulas above.

Here we need *recalculating* the $c$-numbers as follows. If $c$ is assigned to periodic $\delta$ then the corresponding $c$-number of a fundamental subdiagram $\tilde{\delta}$ will be $c+(i-j)k$ for the coordinates $(i, j)$ (inside $\delta$) of the first box in the first nonempty row of the subdiagram $\tilde{\delta}$. Upon such a recalculation, we call the set of fundamental subdiagrams a *fundamental subpair*.

Here we need to choose the first line, i.e. the one with $i = 1$. It is was also necessary in the definition of the basic subdiagram. Changing the position of the first row results in recalculating the corresponding $c$-number. If the first box (with $i = 1, j = 1$) remains in the same principal diagonal $i = j$+const, then there will be no $c$-change.

The constraint for the $c$-numbers of the new (periodic) pairs remains the same as for the old pairs. Thanks to the condition $t^r = q^s$, it reads:

$$c_a - c_b \;\not\in\; (1/r)\mathbf{Z} \;\text{ for all } 1 \le a, b \le m.$$

An *s-partition* of $\{\Delta, C\}$ is a collection $\{\tilde{\delta}^p_a,\ 0 \le a \le s-1,\ 1 \le p \le m\}$ of increasing skew partitions $\tilde{\delta}^p = \cup_a \tilde{\delta}^p_a$ of some fundamental subdiagrams $\tilde{\delta}^p$ of $\delta^p$. Here, first, the $c$ numbers of $\tilde{\delta}^p_a$ are recalculated as the ones for $\delta^p$. Second, the integer $a$ is added to the resulting $c$-number for every $\tilde{\delta}^p_a$.

For the representation of a skew diagram $\delta$ of degree $n$ as a union of all its boxes counted from the last box through the first one, considered above, if $c$ is assigned to $\delta$, then the $c$-number of the $a$-th box, denoted $\delta_a$, is $c + (i_a - j_a)k + a$, where $0 \le a \le n-1$.

*Equivalence.* New pairs $\{\Delta, C\}$ and $\{\Delta', C'\}$ are called equivalent if they can be obtained from each other by a permutation of the components and the corresponding $c$-numbers combined with adding arbitrary integers to the $c$-numbers. So only $c_i \bmod \mathbf{Z}$ matter in the (new) equivalence classes. Also we may shift a diagram $\delta$ in the $(i,j)$-plane by $(i_o, j_o)$ replacing at the same time $c$ by $c - k(i_o - j_o)$.

Given a new pair, the fundamental subpairs and their $s$-partitions are called equivalent if they coincide combinatorially inside $\Delta$. One checks that two partitions are equivalent if and only if the corresponding pairs (the diagrams and their $c$-numbers) coincide up to a permutation of the components together with the $c$-numbers.

Given a subpair or its partition, treated as a set of skew diagrams with the $c$-numbers assigned by the above construction, one naturally constructs its weight and then defines the corresponding irreducible representations of $\mathcal{H}_n$ and/or $\mathcal{H}^o_n$.

*SL-Equivalence.* The subpairs will be called *$SL-$equivalent* if the corresponding weights can be obtained from each other by adding a common constant. Respectively, their partitions are $SL$-equivalent if they may be obtained from each other by proper permuting the $a$-components.

The latter permutation may be necessary when we add a constant which is an integer. Indeed, we add $a$ to the $c$-number (and the weight) of $\tilde{\delta}^p_a$ always assuming that $0 \le a \le s-1$. So we may need the reduction modulo $s$ here, which leads to a certain geometric restructuring of the diagram due to the relation $s = kr$. After such restructuring, a permutation of the components $\tilde{\delta}^p_a$ of the resulting $s$-partition may be needed, because we consider only increasing partitions.

The corresponding irreducible representations of $\mathcal{H}^o_n$ remain in the same isomorphism classes under the $SL$-equivalence.

**Theorem 6.5.** *i) Given $r, s, n$, irreducible $X$-semisimple representations of $\mathcal{HH}_n$ up to multiplication of $\pi$ by a nonzero constant are in one-to-one correspondence with the equivalence classes of new pairs $\{\Delta, C\}$ consisting of $r$-periodic sets $\Delta$ of degree $n$ and the c-numbers. The relations (6.15) hold for the weight $\xi$ associated with $\{\Delta, C\}$, and the corresponding representation is $U = U^\xi_X$ from the Main Theorem. It is $X$-unitary and its $X$-spectrum is simple.*

*ii) Let $s = 1$. Upon restriction to the affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n$, the above module $U = U^\xi_X$ associated to $\{\Delta, C\}$ is a direct sum of the $\mathcal{H}_n$-modules associated to the fundamental subpairs, which are, we recall, the fundamental skew subdiagrams of $\{\delta^p, 1 \le p \le m\}$ supplied with the corresponding (recalculated) c-numbers. Each of these representations appears exactly once in the decomposition.*

*iii) For arbitrary $s > 0$, the module $U$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of the $\mathcal{H}_n$-modules associated with the increasing s-partitions of the fundamental subdiagrams $\{\tilde{\delta}^p\}$, where, recall, the integer $a$ is added to the c-number of the partition component $\tilde{\delta}^p_a$. We treat such partitions as sets of $ms$ skew diagrams equipped with the c-numbers and define the $\mathcal{H}_n$-modules correspondingly. The diagrams $\tilde{\delta}^p_a$ can be empty for some $a$; they do not contribute to the decomposition.*

*iv) The previous claim holds for the algebra $\mathcal{HH}^o_n$ and the irreducible module $U = U^\xi_X$ defined for this algebra in terms of the restriction of the above weight $\xi$ to $\mathbf{C}[X_i X_j^{-1}]$ (this $U$ is not a restriction of the above $U$ to $\mathcal{HH}^o_n$). The following change is necessary because the translations $c_i \mapsto c_i + c$ for $1 \le i \le m$, and $c \in \mathbf{C}$ doesn't change the equivalence classes. Namely, the summation in the $\mathcal{H}^o_n$-decomposition of $U$ has to be reduced to $SL$-nonequivalent fundamental subpairs and nonequivalent s-partitions.*

*v) The $\mathcal{HH}^o_n$-module $U^\xi_X$ is finite-dimensional if and only if $\Delta = \{\delta\}$ and $\delta$ is either the infinite column as $r > 0$ or the infinite row as $r < 0$.*

*In either case, $r = \pm n$ and $s$ is an arbitrary natural number relatively prime to $n$. When $s = 1$ the dimension of this representation is* 1*. Generally, it equals $s^{n-1}$.* $\square$

Part v) readily follows from ii) because the number of nonequivalent fundamental subdiagrams of a periodic diagram is infinite unless it is a column (infinite) or a row. Let us describe the partitions in this case and apply it to the dimension formula.

An $s$-partition of the $n$-column or $n$-row is a decomposition

$$n = n_0 + \cdots + n_{s-1} \text{ for } n_a \in \mathbf{Z}_+.$$

The numbers $n_a$ are identified with the consecutive segments, maybe empty, of the column (or the row), counted from the last box through the first one. Recall that the $c$-number of the $a$-th segment (and the corresponding weight) are increased by $a$, by the definition. The dimension of the corresponding irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}_n^o$ is $n!/(n_0! \cdots n_{s-1}!)$.

Since we may add a common integer modulo $s$ to the $c$-numbers without changing the $SL$-equivalence class, there will be exactly $s$ different decompositions of $n$ in every $SL$-equivalence class of the $s$-partitions. It readily gives the dimension formula $s^{n-1}$ from v). A direct calculation (without the $\mathcal{H}_n^o$-decomposition) is not difficult as well. See Theorem 5.3, formula (6.23) and Theorem 8.5 below, where the "row-column" representations are considered in detail for arbitrary root systems.

Recently Berest, Etingof, and Ginzburg checked that the relation $k = \pm s/n$, provided that $s \in \mathbf{Z}_+$ is not divisible by $n$, is necessary for the existence of finite-dimensional irreducible representations of $\mathcal{HH}_n^o$ in the rational limit. They also found that if such a representation exists then its dimension is divisible by $s^{n-1}$ and its $S_n$-character is divisible by the one for $\mathbf{C}[Q/sQ]$ for the root lattice

$$Q \;=\; \oplus_{i=1}^{n-1}\mathbf{Z}(e_i - e_{i+1}) \;\subset\; \mathbf{Z}^n = \oplus_i \mathbf{Z} e_i.$$

See also [CO] (the complete classification of irreducible representations as $n = 2$) and a paper by Dezélée with some results about finite-dimensional representations in the rational limit.

When restricted to the nonaffine Hecke subalgebra $\mathbf{H}_n = \langle T_i,\ 0 < i < n\rangle$, the module from v) becomes isomorphic to the $t$-counterpart of $\mathbf{C}[Q/sQ]$. Here we use that the above $\mathcal{H}_n^o$-modules associated with the decompositions $n = n_0 + \cdots + n_{s-1}$ are the corresponding parabolically induced $\mathbf{H}_n$-modules. One may use (6.23) and Theorem 8.5 below to generalize this statement to arbitrary root systems.

Thus the standard deformation argument, combined with what was proven in the paper by Berest, Etingof, Ginzburg, readily shows that our "column-row" representations are well defined and remain irreducible upon the rational degeneration, and, moreover, that their character formula holds exactly, i.e. without an unknown multiplier.

Actually here one can employ a more general method, based on the existence of an isomorphism of $\mathcal{HH}$ and its rational degeneration $\mathcal{HH}''$ upon proper completion. For instance, it holds for $q = e^h, t = q^k$ as $k \neq 0$ over the formal series in terms of $\sqrt{h}$, which was conjectured by Etingof. It can be proved by combining the Lusztig-type isomorphism discussed in the Appendix of [C1] and the formula connecting the trigonometric and rational *differential* Dunkl operators. The first connects $\mathcal{HH}$ and its trigonometric degeneration $\mathcal{HH}'$, the second leads to an identification of $\mathcal{HH}'$ and $\mathcal{HH}''$. It is not just a formal isomorphism. It establishes an explicit isomorphism between finite-dimensional representations of $\mathcal{HH}$ as $q, t$ are not roots of unity and $\mathcal{HH}''$ for nonzero $k$.

The representations from v) are unique finite-dimensional representations among all irreducible representations, not only among the $X$-semisimple ones. To see this we will generalize the Bernstein-Zelevinsky classification.

We would like to mention recent work [Va] devoted to the $K$-theoretic classification of irreducible representations of $\mathcal{HH}$ for arbitrary roots systems (with coinciding $k$) subject to the constraint $t^r = q^s$ from the Theorem. It is similar to [KL1], however involves more sophisticated geometric methods and combinatorial problems. In the case of $GL_n$, the Vasserot classification is expected to be equivalent to Theorem 6.6. It also leads to a description of finite-dimensional representations including the dimension formula for arbitrary root systems. See Theorem 8.5 below.

*General representations of $\mathcal{HH}_n$.* The classification will be given in terms of periodic diagrams but with the following relaxation of the conditions from (6.26):

$$n_i \geq n_{i+1} \text{ or } \{n_i = n_{i+1} - 1 \ \text{ and } m_i \geq m_{i+1} - 1\}. \tag{6.27}$$

We call such diagrams *generalized*. Respectively, we define the *generalized pairs* and then construct the corresponding weights using the same formulas as above. For generic $q, t$, an arbitrary irreducible representation of $\mathcal{HH}_n$ is induced from an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}_n$. This can be proved following [C1]. Therefore all of them are infinite-dimensional for such $q, t$.

**Theorem 6.6.** *Imposing the relation $t^r = q^s$ for $r > 0, s > 0, (r, s) = 1$, all $X$-cyclic irreducible $\mathcal{HH}_n$-modules up to isomorphism and multiplication $\pi$ by a constant are in one-to-one correspondence with the generalized new pairs $\{\Delta, C\}$ up to the equivalence which is defined in the same way as above.* □

These modules are quotients of the induced modules $I = I_{\Delta,C}$ corresponding to the weights associated with $\{\Delta, C\}$. The construction of such weights involves the basic fundamental subdiagrams formed by consecutive rows of $\{\tilde{\delta}^p\}$. The change of such subdiagrams can be compensated by a proper change of the corresponding $c$-numbers.

The induced modules $I$ are isomorphic to the affine Hecke algebra

$$\mathcal{H}_n^y \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \langle \pi,\ T_i,\ 1 \le i \le n-1 \rangle.$$

Let $I' = I/(\sum \mathcal{H}_n^y(1 - s_i))$ summed over the simple (nonaffine) reflections $s_i$ corresponding to adjacent boxes in the rows of the basic fundamental subdiagrams of $\Delta$. It is an $\mathcal{HH}_n$-module and the module from the theorem is a unique irreducible nonzero quotient of $I'$. Cf. [C11] and references therein.

Here $r > 0$. Note that we can skip the case of $r < 0$ because it follows formally from the positive case thanks to the automorphism of $\mathcal{HH}_n$ sending

$$X_i \mapsto X_i,\ \pi \mapsto \pi,\ q \mapsto q,\ T_i \mapsto -T_i,\ t \mapsto t^{-1}.$$

The $w$-periodicity and other definitions remain unchanged. However the following reservation about the fundamental subdiagrams and their $s$-partitions is needed.

We assume that they are intersections of a given periodic diagram with sufficiently big *skew* diagrams. Thus they can be of generalized type, but their upper-left and lower-right boundaries in a given generalized $r$-periodic diagram are intersections with some skew paths.

Similarly, the partitions are portions of fundamental subdiagrams between consecutive skew paths. The $s$-partitions of fundamental subpairs of $\{\Delta, C\}$ describe all *submodules* of the corresponding irreducible representations upon the restriction to $\mathcal{H}_n$. Here we continue considering the increasing partitions: $\delta > \delta'$ if it holds for some disjoint skew diagrams containing them.

Concerning the finite-dimensional $\mathcal{HH}_n^o$-modules, it is clear that the irreducible $X$-cyclic representations of $\mathcal{HH}_n^o$ have infinitely many nonisomorphic $\mathcal{H}_n^o$-submodules unless in the case of the infinite column (recall that $r > 0$). More directly, it is not difficult to construct an infinite chain of $X$-eigenvectors with pairwise distinct eigenvalues if $\Delta$ is not a column. This construction essentially holds for arbitrary root systems however the finite-dimensional representations are not described yet. There is another approach suggested by Vasserot.

*Roots of unity.* We go back to arbitrary root systems. Now let $q$ be a primitive root of unity of order $N$. Then $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi]$ always contains

$$A(N) \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} (N \cdot A) \cap B, \ \text{ where } \ A \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{a \in P^\vee \mid (a, B) \subset \mathbf{Z}\}, \tag{6.28}$$
$$\text{so } A = Q^\vee \ \text{ for } \ B = P, \text{ and } \ \text{always } A \supset Q^\vee.$$

Recall that $Q \subset Q^\vee$ and $P \subset P^\vee$, therefore sometimes $A \not\subset B$ and $A(N) \neq N \cdot A$.

Here and further $q' = q^{1/(2\tilde{m})}$ is assumed to be a primitive root of order $2\tilde{m}N$ unless otherwise stated. Recall that $\tilde{m} \in \mathbf{N}$ is the smallest positive integer such that $\tilde{m}(B, B) \subset \mathbf{Z}$. If $q'$ is a primitive root of order $m'N$ for $m' \mid 2\tilde{m}$, then we shall replace $A$ by $m'(2\tilde{m})^{-1}A$ in the definition of $A(N)$.

Let us describe semisimple irreducible finite-dimensional quotients $V$ of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ assuming that $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi] = A(N)$, i.e. the stabilizer of $\xi$ is the smallest possible, and $\Upsilon_+[\xi] = \hat{W}^\flat = \Upsilon_-[\xi]$. The main constraint (6.15) becomes $\Upsilon_0[\xi] = \hat{W}^\flat$ in this case.

Theorem 6.1 states that the spectrum of $\{X_b\}$ in any $V$ has to be simple, the dimension is always $|W| \cdot |B/A(N)|$, and $\{V\}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with one-dimensional characters $\varrho(a)$ of the group $A(N)$, which determine the action via $S$ of $A(N)$ on $V(\xi)$. To be more exact, the $V$-quotients up to isomorphisms are in one-to-one correspondence with the pairs $\{\, \varrho,\ \text{orbit}\ \ q^{\hat{W}(\!(\xi)\!)}\,\}$. We denote them

$$V \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} V[\xi,\varrho],\ V[\xi,\varrho] \simeq V[\xi',\varrho]\ \text{ if }\ q^{\xi'} = q^{\hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)}\ \text{ for }\ \hat{w}\in\hat{W}. \tag{6.29}$$

The isomorphisms here are established using the intertwiners $\Phi_{\hat{w}}$.

Concerning the unitary structure, let us calculate $\mu_{\bullet}$ on $A(N)$. Setting $N_\alpha = N/(N,\nu_\alpha)$, the scalar products $(a,\alpha^\vee) = (a,\alpha)/\nu_\alpha$ are divisible by $N_\alpha$ as $a\in A(N)$, $\alpha\in R$. On the other hand, $q_\alpha = q^{\nu_\alpha}$ is a primitive root of order $N_\alpha$. Using formula (1.13),

$$\mu_{\bullet}(a) \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \prod_{\alpha\in R|(a,\alpha)>0} \Bigl(\frac{t_\alpha^{-N_\alpha/2} - t_\alpha^{N_\alpha/2} q^{N_\alpha(\alpha,\xi)}}{t_\alpha^{N_\alpha/2} - t_\alpha^{-N_\alpha/2} q^{N_\alpha(\alpha,\xi)}}\Bigr)^{((a,\alpha^\vee)/N_\alpha)} =$$

$$\prod_{\alpha\in R_+} \Bigl(\frac{t_\alpha^{-N_\alpha/2} - t_\alpha^{N_\alpha/2} q^{N_\alpha(\alpha,\xi)}}{t_\alpha^{N_\alpha/2} - t_\alpha^{-N_\alpha/2} q^{N_\alpha(\alpha,\xi)}}\Bigr)^{((a,\alpha^\vee)/N_\alpha)} \tag{6.30}$$

for $a\in A(N)$. By the way, it is clear from this formula that $\mu_{\bullet}$ is a homomorphism from $A(N)$ to the multiplicative group of the field $\mathbf{Q}(t_\alpha^N, q^{N(\xi,\alpha)})$. It was already checked in the theorem. We come to the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.7.** *Assuming that $q$ is a primitive root of unity of degree $N$ and*

$$\hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi] \ =\ A(N),\ \Upsilon_+[\xi] = \hat{W}^\flat = \Upsilon_-[\xi],$$

*$X$-semisimple irreducible quotients of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ exist if and only if*

$$\Upsilon_0[\xi] \ =\ \hat{W}^\flat\ \textit{ i.e. } X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^\xi) \neq 1 \textit{ for all } \tilde{\alpha}\in\tilde{R}. \tag{6.31}$$

*Such quotients $V[\xi,\varrho]$ are described by the characters $\varrho$ of $A(N)$. The pseudo-unitary structure exists if and only if*

$$\varrho(a)^*\varrho(a) \ =\ \mu_{\bullet}(a)\ \textit{for the generators of}\ A(N).$$

*Comment on finite stabilizers.* When $q$ is a root of unity, the case of finite stabilizators is, in a sense, opposite to the case of representations $V[\xi,\varrho]$. Indeed, the group $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\xi]$ is finite if and only if the set $\Upsilon_*[\xi]$ is finite. The check is simple. If the latter set is infinite than it contains infinitely many elements in the form $a\hat{w}$ for a fixed $\hat{w}$ and $a\in A(N)$, because the quotient $\hat{W}/A(N)$ is finite. Note that $A(N)$ is normal in $\hat{W}$, so this quotient is a group. We conclude that $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)]$ is infinite.

However it is conjugated to $\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\xi]$ due to (6.12), so the latter has to be infinite as well.

Recall that the existence of the pseudo-unitary structure on $V$ reads:

$$S^{\star}_{\hat{w}}S_{\hat{w}} = \mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w}) \text{ in } V(\xi) \text{ for } \hat{w}\in \hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\xi] \text{ of finite order.} \tag{6.32}$$

We are going to check that here $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})$ is ±1 and, moreover, automatically 1 in many case.

**Proposition 6.8.** *For an element $\hat{w}$ in $\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\xi]$ of finite order, $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w}) = \pm 1$ without any assumptions on $q, t, \xi$. Moreover, $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w}) = 1$ if the order of $\hat{w}$ is $2M+1$, i.e. odd, or $2(2M+1)$.*

*Proof.* First we consider the case $\hat{w}^2 = 1$. Then $\lambda(\hat{w}) = -\hat{w}(\lambda(\hat{w}))$ and each $X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^{\xi})$ appears in the product (6.16) together with $X^{-1}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^{\xi})$ thanks to $\hat{w}(q^{\xi}) = q^{\xi}$. If $X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^{\xi}) \neq X^{-1}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^{\xi})$ then the corresponding binomials will annihilate each other, i.e. their contribution to the product will be 1. However they can conside. There are two possiblilities: $X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^{\xi}) = \pm 1$. If $X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^{\xi}) = -1$ then

$$\Bigl(\frac{t_{\alpha}^{-1/2} - q_{\alpha}^{j}t_{\alpha}^{1/2}X_{\alpha}(q^{\xi})}{t_{\alpha}^{1/2} - q_{\alpha}^{j}t_{\alpha}^{-1/2}X_{\alpha}(q^{\xi})}\Bigr) \;=\; 1.$$

The equality $X_{\tilde{\alpha}}(q^{\xi}) = 1$ is impossible thanks to the constraint (6.15). So we get the complete annihilation of all factors in $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})$.

Now we assume that $\hat{w}$ is of finite order. Then $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})$ has to be a root of unity. Under the reality conditions $|q| = 1,\ k_{\alpha}\in \mathbf{R},\ \xi\in\mathbf{R}^n$, $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})$ is real and can be ± only. Arbitrary triple $\{q, k, \xi\}$ can be continuously deformed to the triple above, without changing the group $\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\xi]$ and the value of $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})$. Indeed, the structure of $\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\xi]$ depends on certain multiplicative relations among $q_{(\alpha,\xi)}$ and $q_{\alpha}^{k_{\alpha}}$. Therefore we need to deform $\{q, k, \xi\}$ within some subvariety, which is possible. We get the claim about ±1.

It gives that the orders of

$$\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w}) \ \text{ and } \ \mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w}^{2M+1}) = \mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})^{2M+1}$$

always coincide. If the order of $\hat{w}$ is odd or $2(2M+1)$, then $\mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})$ has to be 1 thanks to the claim about the elements of the second order. □

## 7. Spherical representations

It is a continuation of the previous section. The parameters $q, t, \xi$ are still arbitrary (nongeneric). We assume that $t_{\text{sht}} \neq \pm 1 \neq t_{\text{lng}}$ unless otherwise stated. Let us continue the list of the basic definitions.

*Spherical and cospherical representations.* A $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$-module $V$ is called $X$-*spherical* if it is generated by an element $v$, a *spherical vector*, such that

$$\begin{aligned} T_i(v) \ &= \ X_{\alpha_i}(q^{\rho_k})v = \ t_i\, v \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le n, \\ X_a(v) \ &= \ X_a^{-1}(q^{\rho_k})v = q^{-(a\,,\,\rho_k)}v \ \text{ for } \ a \in B, \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

It is $X$-cospherical if the space of linear form $\varpi$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \varpi(T_i(u)) \ &= \ t_i\, \varpi(u) \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le n, \\ \varpi(X_a(u)) \ &= \ q^{-(a\,,\,\rho_k)}\varpi(u) \ \text{ for } \ a \in B, \ u \in V, \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

is nonzero, and at least one of them, called a *cospherical form*, does not vanish identically on each $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$- submodule of $V$.

We will mainly call the vectors $v$ satisfying (7.1) $X$-*invariants* and the cospherical forms $X$-*coinvariants*.

It will be assumed that the spaces of invariants and coinvariants are finite-dimensional. It is true for all modules in the category $\mathcal{O}_X$.

Note that $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$-quotient of a spherical representation is spherical, and nonzero submodules of a cospherical module are cospherical.

An $X$-spherical module is $X$-cospherical and vice versa for pseudo-unitary modules $V$ in the category $\mathcal{O}_X$. The bi-form identifies the spaces of invariants $v$ and coinvariants $\varpi$. Recall that it is nondegenerate $\star$-invariant and $*$-hermitian. One can drop the last condition in this definition.

The cospherical form is constructed as follows. If $v$ is a given spherical vector then the linear form $(u, v)$ is a coinvariant and has no $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$-submodules in its kernel because the latter have to be orthogonal to $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat v = V$. Therefore $(u, v)$ is a cospherical form.

To construct an $X$-spherical vector from a $X$-cospherical form, we use that the coinvariants vanish on $V_X^\infty(\xi)$ (these spaces are finite-dimensional) unless the $X$-character $\xi$ is from the second line of (7.1). Indeed, they obviously vanish on $V_X(\xi)$ for such $\xi$, so we can go to $V_X^\infty(\xi)/V_X(\xi)$ and continue by induction. Therefore an arbitrary coinvariant $\varpi(u)$ can be represented as $(u, v)$ for an invariant $v$. The latter has to be a spherical vector for a cospherical form $\varpi$. Otherwise the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat v \neq V$ would belong to the kernel of $\varpi$, which is impossible. This complement is nonzero since $V \in \mathcal{O}_X$.

Concerning the coincidence of the space of invariants and coinvariants for $V \in \mathcal{O}_X$, it is not necessary to assume that the form is $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-invariant. It is sufficient to have a nondegenerate $*$-bilinear and $\mathcal{H}_X^\flat$-invariant form.

A $Y$-spherical vector, a cospherical form $\varpi$, $Y$-invariants, and $Y$-coinvariants are defined by the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} &T_i(v) = t_i\, v,\ \pi_r(v) = v, \quad \text{for} \quad i > 0,\ \pi_r \in \Pi^\flat, \\ &Y_a(v) \ = \ q^{(a\,,\,\rho_k)}v \quad \text{for} \quad a \in B, \\ &\varpi(T_i(u)) = t_i\, \varpi(u),\ \varpi(Y_a(u)) = q^{(a\,,\,\rho_k)}\varpi(u). \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

Note the different signs of $(a\,,\,\rho_k)$ for $X$ and $Y$.

A module $V$ with the one-dimensional space of invariants $v$ has a unique nonzero spherical submodule. It is the $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-span of $v$. Dualizing, a module $V$ with the one-dimensional space of coinvariants $\varpi$ has a unique nonzero cospherical quotient. It is $V$ divided by the sum of all $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-submodules of $V$ inside the kernel of $\varpi$. If $V$ is already (co)spherical then it has no proper (co)spherical submodules or respectively quotients.

The main example is $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ which has a unique $Y$-cospherical quotient because the space of $Y$-coinvariants $\varpi$ from (7.3) for the module $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ is one-dimensional. Cf. [C1], Lemma 6.2.

The polynomial representation $\mathcal{V} \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b] = \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b, b \in B]$ is $Y$-spherical and maps onto an arbitrary given $Y$-spherical module. The constant term is its $Y$-coinvariant. If $q, t$ are generic then $\mathcal{V}$ is irreducible and automatically $Y$-cospherical. When $q$ is a root of unity there are infinitely many irreducible spherical modules.

In the definition of spherical and cospherical modules, one may take any one-dimensional character of the affine Hecke subalgebra with respect to $X$ or $Y$ in place of (7.1), (7.2), (7.3). The spherical represenatation for generic $q, t$ remains isomorphic to the space of polynomilas however with different formulas for the $\hat{T}$-operators depending on the choice of the character. The functional representations, which are defined via the discretization of these operators, also change. We will stick to the "plus-character" in this paper, leaving a straightforward generalization to the reader.

It is worth mentioning that relations between the spherical and cospherical representations constructed for different one-dimensional characters play an important role in the theory of $\mathcal{HH}$ as well as for the classical representations of affine Hecke algebras. An example is a general theory of the shift operators. We will not consider these questions in the paper.

*Primitive modules.* The definition is of general nature but these modules are mainly needed for finite-dimensional representations. Recall that finite-dimensional $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-modules exist only when either $q$ is a root of unity or $q$ is generic and $k$ is special rational.

By $Y$*-principal* spherical $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-modules, we mean $Y$-spherical $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-modules equipped with nondegenerate $\star$-invariant $*$-bilinear forms. So these modules are also $Y$-cospherical. Vice versa, the modules which are spherical and at the same time cospherical have to be principal thanks to Proposition 3.2. In this definition, we do not assume the pairing to be $*$-hermitian. We only need it to be nondegenerate.

A $Y$-principal module is called $Y$*-primitive* if the dimension of the space of $Y$-coinvariants is one. Using the nondegenerate form, we conclude that the dimension of the space of $Y$-invariants has to be one as well. Note that these dimensions always coincide for $Y$-principal spherical modules in the category $\mathcal{O}_Y$, as it was discussed above (for $X$ instead of $Y$).

A primitive module has no nontrivial spherical submodules and cospherical quotients. The key property of such modules, a variant of the Schur Lemma, is that a nonzero $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-homomorphism between two primitive modules $V_1 \to V_2$ is an isomorphism. Indeed, the image of $V_1$ is spherical and therefore must coincide with $V_2$. Hence $V_2$ is a cospherical quotient of $V_1$ which is impossible unless the kernel is zero. We also have the following proposition.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let $V$ be a $Y$-principal module from $\mathcal{O}_Y$ embedded into a finite direct sum $V_{sum} = \oplus V_i$ of $Y$-primitive modules such that its intersections with all $V_i$ are nonzero. Then $V$ coincides with $V_{sum}$.*

*Proof.* The $Y$-invariants of $V_{\text{sum}}$ are linear combinations $\sum c_i v_i$ of the spherical vectors $v_i \in V_i$. The space of $Y$-invariants of $V$ is smaller than the space of invariants of $V_{\text{sum}}$ if $V \neq V_{\text{sum}}$.

Similarly, $Y$-coinvariants of $V_{\text{sum}}$ are linear combinations $\varpi = \sum c_i \varpi_i$ of the cospherical forms $\varpi_i$ of $V_i$ natuarlly extended to the sum. Since $V$ has nonzero intersections with $V_i$ all such $\varpi \neq 0$ remain nonzero when restricted to $V$. Indeed, $c_i \neq 0$ for certain $i$ and if $\varpi(V) = 0$ then the cospherical form $\varpi_i$ of $V_i$ vanishes on $V \cap V_i$, which is impossible.

Using the coincidence of the dimensions of the spaces of invariants and coinvariants for $Y$-principal modules in $\mathcal{O}_Y$ we conclude that $V = V_{\text{sum}}$. □

Later we will see that a $Y$-primitive $X$-semisimple module is irreducible. Also a $Y$-principal $X$-cyclic module, i.e. that generated by an $X$-eigenvector, is $Y$-primitive and a $Y$-spherical $X$-cyclic irreducible module which has at least one coinvariant is primitive (the next proposition).

We note that a $Y$-spherical module such that $V = \oplus_\xi V_X^\infty(\xi)$ has to be finite-dimensional (in particular, one can take $V \in \mathcal{O}_X$). Indeed, $V = \oplus_\xi V_Y^\infty(\xi)$ because it is a quotient of the $Y$-induced module with the "plus-character" as the weight. Finitely generated modules which has such decompositions for $X$ and $Y$ together are finite-dimensional. See the previous section.

Assuming that a finite-dimensional $Y$-spherical module $V$ possesses at least one $Y$-coinvariant $\varpi \neq 0$, let $\tilde{V}$ be the quotient of $V$ with respect to the intersection of all radicals of all $*$-bilinear $\star$-invariant forms. Since $V$ is finite-dimensional there exists a $Y$-coinvariant with the kernel precisely coinciding with the intersection of the kernels of all coinvariants. This coinvariant makes $\tilde{V}$ cospherical and therefore $Y$-principal. Obviously it is the universal $Y$-principal quotient of $V$.

It is worth mentioning that spherical (finite-dimensional) representations in the classical theory of affine Hecke algebra are defined with respect to its nonaffine Hecke subalgebra and always have isomorphic spaces of invariants and coinvariants provided that the latter algebra is semisimple. Therefore irreducible spherical modules are primitive in the above sense, which readily gives that (affine) primitive modules are nothing else but irreducible quotients of the polynomial representation of the affine Hecke algebra.

In the next proposition, the field of constants is assumed algebraically closed. Note that the definition of principal and primitive modules does not depend on the particular choice of the field of constants. They remain principal or primitive over any extension of $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$ and vice versa. If they are defined over $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$ and become principle/primitive over its extension then they are already principle/primitive over $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$. Recall that the $*$-bilinear forms above and below are not supposed to be $*$-hermitian. By the radicals, we mean the left radicals of such forms.

**Proposition 7.2.** *A $Y$-spherical module $V \in \mathcal{O}_X$ is principal if and only if the dimensions of its $X$-eigenspaces $V(\xi)$ are no greater than one and there exists a $Y$-coinvariant of $V$ which is nonzero at all nonzero $X$-eigenvectors. The sum $V_{sum} = \oplus V_i$ of $Y$-principal modules from $\mathcal{O}_X$ is $Y$-principal if and only if*

$$Spec_X(V_i) \cap Spec_X(V_j) \ = \ \emptyset \ \ for \ \ i \neq j. \tag{7.4}$$

*If $Y$-principal $V \in \mathcal{O}_X$ is generated by its $X$-eigenvectors then it is a direct sum of primitive modules.*

*Proof.* In the first place, given a $Y$-spherical vector $v \in V$ (by definition, it generates $V$), the coinvariants $\varpi$ are in one-to-one correspondence with $\star$-invariant $*$-bilinear forms on $V$. Namely, any such form can be represented as $\varpi'(f_1 f_2^*)$ for $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ where $\varpi'$ is the pullback of $\varpi$ with respect to the $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$-homomorphism $\mathcal{V} \to V$, sending 1 to $v$. I.e. $(v_1, v_2)_\varpi = \varpi'(f_1 f_2^*)$, where

$$v_1 = f_1(v) = f_1(X)v, \ v_2 = f_2(v) = f_2(X)v.$$

It follows from Proposition 3.2.

The form may be degenerate and non-hermitian. Recall that hermitian forms (sarisfying $(u, v) = (v, u)^*$) correspond to coinvariants of $\mathcal{V}$ such that $\varpi'(f^*) = \varpi'(f)^*$. We do not use hermitian forms in the proposition.

The radical of $( \ , \ )_\varpi$ is the greatest $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$-submodule of $V$ inside the kernel of $\varpi$. Hence this form is nondegenerate if and only if the coinvariant $\varpi$ is a cospherical vector.

Let us check that in the category $\mathcal{O}_X$, a $Y$-coinvariant $\varpi$ is a cospherical form if and only if

$$\varpi(e) \neq 0 \ \text{ for all } X-\text{eigenvectors } e \in V. \tag{7.5}$$

These relations are obviously sufficient since any submodule of $V$ has at least one nonzero $X$-eigenvector. Let us verify that (7.5) is necessary.

If $\varpi(e) = 0$ for such $e$, then $\varpi(\mathcal{H}^\flat_Y\,\mathcal{X}(e)) = 0 = \varpi(\mathcal{HH}^\flat(e))$, where by $\mathcal{X}$ we mean the algebra generated by $X_b$ for $b \in B$.

Now, if there exists a weight $\xi$ such that $\dim V(\xi) > 1$, then $V$ cannot be cospherical because any given coinvariant vanishes on a proper linear combination of $e_1$ and $e_2$. Thus the first claim holds as well as relations (7.4).

Note that the same argument proves that the dimension of the space of $Y$-coinvariants of a $X$-cyclic module is no greater than one. In particular, $Y$-principal $X$-cyclic modules are $Y$-primitive. Indeed, otherwise $\mathcal{HH}^\flat v \neq V$ for an arbitrary $X$-eigenvector $v$ of $V$ because $\mathcal{HH}^\flat v$ belongs to the kernel of a proper coinvarinat of $V$ vanishing at $v$, which always exists if there are at least two non-proportional coinvariants.

Coming to the last claim, for each $X$-eigenvector $e \neq 0$ in $V$, let $\mathcal{W}_e$ be the hyperplane of all coinvariants of $V$ vanishing at $e$ in the space $\mathcal{W}$ of all coinvariants. The codimensions of $\mathcal{W}_e$ are one because $V$ is principal. The intersection of all $\mathcal{W}_e$ consists of the coinvariants vanishing at all $X$-eigenvectors of $V$, so it is zero because $V$ is generated by its $X$-eigenvectors.

Since we have at least two different $\mathcal{W}_e$ we may pick finitely many coinvariants $\varpi_i$ (two are sufficient for the induction step) which do not belong all to any particular $\mathcal{W}_e$ and consider the direct sum of the quotients $V_i$ of $V$ by the corresponding radicals. The resulting map $V \to \oplus V_i$ is injective. Indeed, for any $X$-eigenvector $e^o \neq 0$ in its kernel, the hyperplane $\mathcal{W}_{e^o}$ would contain all $\varpi_i$, which is impossible.

Applying this procedure repeatedly to the resulting factors $V_i$ (the quotients of $V$ are generated by $X$-eigenvectors as well as $V$) we can eventually make all $V_i$ in the sum primitive. We may also assume that neither $V_i$ can be removed from the sum $\oplus V_i$, i.e. that the intersections $V \cap V_i$ are all nonzero, and use the previous proposition. $\square$

**Semisimple spherical representations.** Generally speaking, primitive modules can be reducible. However in this paper we will mainly stick to the semisimple modules. Let us check that $Y$-primitive $X$-semisimple modules are irreducible.

If such $V$ has a $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-submodule $U$, then its orthogonal complement $U^\perp$ with respect to the (unique) $\star$-invariant $*$-bilinear form has zero intersection with $U$. Here we use that the $X$-spectrum of $Y$-principal module is simple. Hence $U \oplus U^\perp = V$. However this is impossible because the space of $Y$-invariants of $V$ is one-dimensional and generates $V$ as a $\mathcal{H\!H}^\flat$-module.

Let $V$ be an irreducible $X$-semisimple $\mathcal{H\!H}^\flat$-module which is also $Y$-cospherical. Then $V = \mathcal{I}_X[\xi]/\mathcal{J}$ for proper $\xi$ and proper $\mathcal{H\!H}^\flat$-submodule $\mathcal{J}$ such that $\mathcal{J}_\xi \subset \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ for $\mathcal{J}_\xi = \sum \mathcal{H}_Y \Phi_{\hat{w}}$, where the summation is over $\hat{w} \in \ddot{\Upsilon}_*[\xi]$.

It is $Y$-cospherical if and only if $\varpi_+(\mathcal{J}) = 0$ for the plus-character of $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi] \simeq \mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ :

$$\varpi_+(T_i H) = t_i^{1/2} \varpi_+(H),\ \varpi_+(\pi_r H) = \varpi_+(H),\ \varpi_+(1) = 1. \tag{7.6}$$

The condition $\varpi_+(\mathcal{J}) = 0$ readily results in $\Upsilon_*[\xi] = \Upsilon_+[\xi]$ since $\varpi_+(\Phi_{\hat{w}}) \neq 0$ for $\hat{w} \in \ddot{\Upsilon}_-[\xi]$. We see that the condition $\Upsilon_+[\xi] \subset \Upsilon_0[\xi]$ is fulfilled for $\xi$, and for any other $X$-weight $\xi'$, under the assumption that $V$ is irreducible, $X$-semisimple, and $Y$-cospherical.

In such $V$, the eigenspace $V(\xi)$ is one-dimensional and $S_{\hat{w}} = 1$ in $V(\xi)$ for $\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat[\xi]$. Indeed, $\varpi_+(S_{\hat{w}}(1_\xi)) = 1$ in $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ due to the normalization of $S$ from (3.22). Here $1_\xi$ is 1 from $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ with the action of $\{X\}$ via $\xi$. Therefore the same holds in any quotients of $\mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ by submodules belonging to $\operatorname{Ker} \varpi_+$. Since $V(\xi)$ is an irreducible representation of $\hat{W}^\flat[\xi]$, we get that $S_{\hat{w}} \mapsto 1$.

Let us demonstrate that the conditions
a) $\Upsilon_+[\xi] \subset \Upsilon_0[\xi]$, b) $\dim_{\mathbf{C}} V(\xi) = 1$, and
c) $S_{\hat{w}} = 1$ in $V(\xi)$ whenever $\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat[\xi]$
are sufficient to make $V$ irreducible and $Y$-cospherical.

Given a weight $\xi$, first we need to check that

$$\mathcal{J}_\xi = \sum \mathcal{H}_Y \Phi_{\hat{w}} \neq \mathcal{H}_Y, \text{ summed over } \ddot{\Upsilon}_+[\xi],$$

assuming that $\Phi_{\hat{w}}$ are well defined. It is obvious since $\varpi_+(\mathcal{J}_\xi) = 0$. Moreover, the latter relation gives that $U = \mathcal{I}_X[\xi]/\mathcal{J}_\xi$ has a unique cospherical quotient. It is the quotient by the span of all $\mathcal{H\!H}^\flat$-submodules in the kernel of $\varpi_+$ on $U$. Let us denote it by $V$. The restriction of $\varpi_+$ to the eigenspace $V(\xi)$ is nonzero. Really, otherwise it is identically zero on the whole $V$. The quotient of $V$ by the $\mathcal{H\!H}^\flat$-span of the kernel of $\varpi_+$ on $V(\xi)$ is irreducible and cospherical. Hence it coincides with $V$ due to the uniqueness of the cospherical quotients. Moreover, $\dim V(\xi) = 1$, and the action of $\hat{W}^\flat[\xi]$ is trivial. We come to the following theorem.

**Theorem 7.3.** *i) The induced representation* $\mathcal{I}_X[\xi]$ *possesses a nonzero irreducible* $Y$*-cospherical* $X$*-semisimple quotient* $V$ *if and only if*

$$\Upsilon_0[\xi] \supset \Upsilon_+[\xi] \subset \Upsilon_-[\xi]. \tag{7.7}$$

*Such a quotient is unique and has one-dimensional* $V(\xi)$ *with the trivial (*$S_{\hat w}$ *act as* $1$*) action of the group* $\hat W^\flat[\xi]$*. Its* $X$*-spectrum is simple.*

*This* $V$ *is* $X$*-unitary if and only if* $\mu_\bullet(\hat w) = 1$ *for all* $\hat w \in \hat W^\flat_*[\xi]$*. If such* $V$ *is finite-dimensional then it is spherical and, moreover, primitive, i.e. has a unique nonzero* $Y$*-invariant and a unique* $Y$*-coinvariant up to proportionality. Setting* $V = V_{sph}[\xi]$*, the modules* $V_{sph}[\xi']$ *and* $V_{sph}[\xi]$ *are isomorphic if and only if* $q^{\xi'} = q^{\hat w((\xi))}$ *for* $\hat w \in \Upsilon_+[\xi]$*.*

*ii) Finite-dimensional* $V_{sph}[\xi]$ *can be identified with*

$$\mathfrak{F}'[\xi] \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} Funct(\Upsilon'_+[\xi], \mathbf{Q}_\xi) \quad \textit{where} \quad \Upsilon'_+[\xi] \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \Upsilon_+[\xi]/\hat W^\flat_+[\xi]. \tag{7.8}$$

*Here the action of* $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ *is introduced via formulas (4.8) and is well defined on* $\mathfrak{F}'[\xi]$*. The characteristic functions* $\{\chi_{\hat w},\, \hat w \in \Upsilon'_+[\xi]\}$ *form a basis of* $\mathfrak{F}'[\xi]$ *and are permuted by the intertwiners* $S_{\hat w}$ *which become* $\hat w$ *in this module.*

*The pseudo-hermitian form of* $V$ *is proportional to*

$$\langle f, g\rangle' \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum_{\hat w \in \Upsilon'_+[\xi]} \mu_\bullet(\hat w) f(\hat w)\ g(\hat w)^*. \tag{7.9}$$

*Proof.* The "cospherical" part of i) has been already checked. The spectrum of $V$ is simple thanks to Theorem 6.1. The condition (6.18), which is necessary and sufficient for the existence of an invariant $X$-hermitian form on $V$, means that $\mu_\bullet(\hat w) = 1$ for all $\hat w \in \hat W^\flat_*[\xi]$. See also (6.32).

Since the space of $Y$-coinvariants of $V_{\mathrm{sph}}[\xi]$ is one-dimensional, any $\star$-invariant $*$-bilinear form on $V$ is hermitian (skew-symmetric) up to proportionality. It is because $V$ has the "real" structure by the construction: we assume that $*$ fixes $q^\xi$.

Note that any pseudo-hermitian form on $V$ is $X$-definite. The scalar squares of $X$-eigenvectors are nonzero because the $X$-eigenspaces are one-dimensional. Indeed, if one of these squares vanishes then the radical of the form is a nonzero $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-submodule of $V$, which contradicts its irreducibility.

If such $V$ is also finite-dimensional then it is spherical and principal. The space of spherical vectors of $V$ is one-dimensional because so is the space of $\varpi$. See Proposition 7.2.

By the way, we get a surjective $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-homomorphism $\mathcal{V} \to V$ sending 1 to the spherical generator $1_{\mathrm{sph}}$ of $V$. Its kernel has to be an intersection of maximal ideals of $\mathcal{V}$. This argument gives another demonstration of the simplicity of the $X$-spectrum of $V$.

Part ii) is nothing else but a reformulation of i). Really, we may introduce (the action of) $s_i$ and $\hat{w}$ in $V_{\mathrm{sph}}[\xi]$ as $S_i$ and $S_{\hat{w}}$. Then the formulas from ii) will follow from i). ☐

As an immediate application of the proposition, we get that the irreducible representations $V[\xi, \varrho]$ from Proposition 6.7 cannot be, generally speaking, principal (spherical and cospherical). They are cospherical if and only if $\varrho = 1$. For such $\varrho$, $\mu_\bullet(a)$ have to be 1 on $A(N)$ to provide the existence of the $X$-unitary structure. Formulas (6.30) combined with the constraint (6.31) indicate that it may happen only for very special values of the parameters.

*Generic spherical representations.* Let us give a general description of spherical modules as $q$ is a primitive root of unity of order $N \geq 0$.

We will use the lattices $A(N) = (N \cdot A) \cap B$ from (6.28), where

$$A = \frac{m'}{2\tilde{m}} \{a \in P^\vee \mid (a, B) \subset \mathbf{Z}\},\ m' \text{ divides } 2\tilde{m} \tag{7.10}$$

Where $q' = q^{1/(2\tilde{m})}$ is a primitive root of order $m'N$.

To start with, let us assume that $t_\nu$ are generic and establish that the quotient $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ of $\mathcal{V}$ by the radical of the standard form of the polynomial representation is well defined, $Y$-spherical, $Y$-cospherical, $Y$-semisimple, $X$-semisimple, and irreducible.

In the first place, all polynomials $\mathcal{E}_b$ are well defined thanks to the intertwining formulas. See (3.35). Then $e_b = E_b(q^{-\rho_k})\mathcal{E}_b$ are well defined because $E_b(q^{-\rho_k}) \neq 0$ due to (3.15). However $E_b\,(b \in B)$ form a basis of $\mathcal{V}$. So do $\mathcal{E}_b$, and the formulas (4.1) for $\langle \mathcal{E}_c, \mathcal{E}_c \rangle_\circ$, which were obtained for generic $q$, hold in the considered case as well, i.e. define the form $\langle\, ,\, \rangle_\circ$ on $\mathcal{V}$. Its radical $\mathcal{V}_o = $Rad $\langle\, ,\, \rangle_\circ$ can be readily calculated.

**Proposition 7.4.** *i) For generic* $t_\nu$, *the* $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^\flat$*-module* $\widehat{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{V}/\mathcal{V}_0$ *is well defined and*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{V}} \simeq \oplus_b \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\mathcal{E}_b \text{ as } -(\alpha_i^\vee, b_-) \le N_i \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} N/(N,\nu_i),\ 1 \le i \le n, \tag{7.11}$$
$$\{-(\alpha_i^\vee, b_-) = N_i\} \ \Rightarrow\ \{u_b^{-1}(\alpha_i) \in R_- \text{ i.e. } \alpha_i \in \lambda(u_b^{-1})\}.$$

*ii) Given* $b_-$ *from (7.11), let* $W'$ *and* $W^\bullet$ *be subgroups of* $W$ *generated respectively by* $s_i$ *such that* $(\alpha_i^\vee, b_-) = 0$ *and* $-(\alpha_i^\vee, b_-) = N_i$. *Their longest elements will be denoted by* $w_0'$ *and* $w_0^\bullet$. *Then all possible* $u_b^{-1}$ *from (7.11) are represented in the form*

$$w\, w_0^\bullet \ \text{ for } \ w \in W \ \text{ such } \ \text{that } l(w\, w_0^\bullet\, w_0') = l(w) + l(w_0^\bullet) + l(w_0').$$

*The* $Y$*-spectrum of* $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ *is simple and this module is irreducible.*

*Proof.* Given $b_- \in B_-$, formula (1.12) provides the following description of all possible $u_b$ :

$$\alpha \in \lambda(u^{-1}) \Rightarrow (\alpha, b_-) \ne 0. \tag{7.12}$$

Equivalently, $l(u^{-1}w_0') = l(u^{-1}) + l(w_0')$ for the longest element $w_0'$ in the centralizer $W_0'$ of $b_-$ in $W$.

If $-(\alpha_i, b_-) = N_i$, then $\alpha_i \in \lambda(u_b^{-1})$ for such $i$, i.e. $u_b^{-1}$ is divisible by $w_0^\bullet$ in the following exact sense: $l(u_b^{-1}) = l(u_b^{-1}\, w_0^\bullet) + l(w_0^\bullet)$. Here $w_0^\bullet \in W_0^\bullet$ is the longest element. This gives the description of $u_b$ from the proposition.

Since $k$ is generic, $\mathcal{E}_b$ and $\mathcal{E}_c$ have coinciding $q^{b_\sharp}$ and $q^{c_\sharp}$ if and only if $b_- = c_- \mod A(N)$ and $u_b = u_c$. Recall that $A \subset B \subset P$. So $b_- - c_- \in N \cdot P$ in this case. Provided (7.11) for $b$ and $c$, we get that $b_- = c_- + \sum \pm N_j\, \omega_j$ for some indices $j$ and proper signs. Here $(b_-, \alpha_j^\vee) = N_j$ and $(c_-, \alpha_j^\vee) = 0$ for $+N_j\omega_j$ and the other way round for $-N_j\omega_j$.

Let us assume that $u_b = u = u_c$. Transposing $b_-$ and $c_-$, we can find $j$ with the plus-sign of $N_j\omega_j$ in this sum. Then $u^{-1} = u_b$ is divisible by $s_j$. However $l(u^{-1}s_j) = l(u^{-1}) + 1$ because $u = u_c$. This contradiction gives that $u_b$ and $u_c$ cannot coincide and that the spectrum $\mathrm{Spec}_Y(\widehat{\mathcal{V}})$ is simple. Since $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ is spherical (i.e. generated by $\mathcal{E}_0 = 1$) and $Y$-pseudo-unitary it has to be irreducible. ☐

Note that $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ is $X$-semisimple in all known examples. Moreover its $X$-spectrum is simple. It is likely that this is always true. The next theorem gives a different (and more general) construction of spherical representations involving the central characters.

**Theorem 7.5.** *i) The center $\mathcal{Z}$ of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ contains finite sums*

$$
\begin{aligned}
H = \sum_{a\in A(N)} &F_a\, S_a \ \textit{ such that } F_a \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b], \\
&b(F_a) = F_a \ \textit{ for } \ b\in A(N),\ F_{w(a)} = F_a \ \textit{ for } \ w\in W, \ \textit{ and } \\
&F_a\cdot \prod_{[\alpha,j]} (t_\alpha^{1/2} q_\alpha^j X_\alpha - t_\alpha^{-1/2})^{-1} \ \in \ \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b],\ [\alpha,\nu_\alpha j]\in\lambda(a).
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.13}
$$

*ii) The algebra $\mathcal{Z}_X \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[X_b]$ consisting of $W\ltimes A(N)$-invariant polynomials is central as well as the algebra $\mathcal{Z}_Y$ of $W\ltimes A(N)$-invariant polynomials in terms of $Y$. The algebra $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ is a free module of dimension $|W|\,|\,W^\flat/A(N)\,|^2$ over $\mathcal{Z}_X\cdot\mathcal{Z}_Y$.*

*The elements (7.13) for rational $F_a\in\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}(X_b)$ constitute the center $\mathcal{Z}_{loc}$ of the localization $\mathcal{HH}^\flat_{loc}$ of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ by nonzero elements of $\mathcal{Z}_X$. The algebra $\mathcal{HH}^\flat_{loc}$ is of dimension $|\,W^\flat/A(N)\,|^2$ over $\mathcal{Z}_{loc}$.*

*iii) Given a central $X$-character, a homomorphism of algebras $\zeta : \mathcal{Z}_X \to \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$, let us denote its kernel by $Ker\,\zeta$. Then*

$$
\mathcal{V}_\zeta \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathcal{V}\,/\,(\mathcal{V}\cdot Ker\ \zeta)
\tag{7.14}
$$

*is a $Y$-spherical module of dimension $|\,W^\flat/A(N)\,|$. It is $X$-semisimple if and only if $\mathcal{V}\cdot Ker\,\zeta$ is an intersection of maximal ideals of $\mathcal{V}$.*

*iv) The module $\mathcal{V}_\zeta$ is irreducible for generic $\zeta$. If it is irreducible then $\mathcal{V}_\zeta^\circ = Hom(\mathcal{V}_\zeta, \mathbf{Q}_\xi)$ is isomorphic to $V[\xi,1]$ from Proposition 6.7, where $Ker\,\zeta \in Ker\,\xi$. The action of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ on $\mathcal{V}_\zeta^\circ$ is via the $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$-linear anti-involution $H\mapsto H^\circ$ fixing $T_i\,(0\le i\le n)$ , fixing $X_b\,(b\in B)$, and sending $\pi_r\mapsto\pi_r^{-1}$.*

*Proof.* Upon the $X$-localization, the defining property of the intertwiners $S_{\hat w}$ readily gives that the elements (7.13) for rational $F_a\in\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}(X_b)$ form the center of the localization $\mathcal{HH}^\flat_{\text{loc}}$. Any element of the latter can be represented in this form with the summation over all $\hat w\in\hat W^\flat$ and arbitrary rational coefficients. Conjugating such sums by $X_b$ and $S_{\hat w}$, we get (7.13). The integrality condition is sufficient (but not necessary) to go back to $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$.

We readily get that $\mathcal{Z}_X$ is central. The automorphisms of $PGL_2^c(\mathbf{Z})$ preserve the center of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$. In particular, $\mathcal{Z}_Y$ is central. The calculation of the rank of this algebra over $\mathcal{Z}_X\cdot\mathcal{Z}_Y$ is a direct corollary of the PBW-theorem (see (2.23)).

We leave the calculation of the rank of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat_{\text{loc}}$ over $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{loc}}$ to the reader; it will not be used in the paper. Note that the calculation of the rank of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ over the center without the $X$-localization is a difficult problem even for $q = 1 = t_{\text{sht}} = t_{\text{lng}}$.

Switching to $\mathcal{V}_\zeta$, its dimension is $|\, W^\flat/A(N)\, |$ because it is a quotient of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ by the left ideal generated by $\operatorname{Ker}\zeta$ and $\operatorname{Ker}\varpi_+ \subset \mathcal{H}_Y^\flat$ for $\varpi_+$ from (7.6).

The $X$-semisimplicity of $\mathcal{V}_\zeta$ readily implies that the $X$-spectrum of this module is simple and $\zeta$ is associated with $\xi$. The module $\mathcal{V}_\zeta^\circ = \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{V}_\zeta, \mathbf{Q}_\xi)$ is $Y$-cospherical and $X$-semisimple with the same spectrum. The action of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ via $H \mapsto H^\circ$ is well defined because this anti-involution preserves $\zeta$. This module is irreducible if and only if $\mathcal{V}_\zeta$ is irreducible. We can apply Theorem 7.3 in this case. It results in $\mathcal{V}_\zeta^\circ = V[\xi, 1]$. $\square$

## 8. Gaussian and self-duality

We follow the notation from the previous section. A $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$- module $V$ is *self-dual* if the involution $\varepsilon$ from (2.9) becomes the conjugation by a certain $*$-linear involution of $V$ upon the restriction to $\operatorname{End}(V)$. A module is called $PGL_2^c(\mathbf{Z})$-invariant if $\varepsilon, \tau_\pm$ act there projectively, i.e. if there are automorphisms of $V$ satisfying

$$\tau_+\tau_-^{-1}\tau_+ \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sigma = \tau_-^{-1}\tau_+\tau_-^{-1},\ \tau_\pm = \varepsilon\tau_\mp\varepsilon^{-1}, \tag{8.1}$$

and inducing the $\varepsilon, \tau_\pm$ from Section 2 on $\operatorname{End}(V)$. By $PGL_2^c(\mathbf{Z})$, we mean the central extension of $PGL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ due to Steinberg introduced by the relations (8.1).

Neither functional nor polynomial representations are self-dual. Either $\tau_-$ or $\tau_+$ act there respectively, but not all together. Actually self-dual semisimple irreducible modules (from $\mathcal{O}_X$) have to be finite-dimensional. Indeed, they belong to both $\mathcal{O}_X$ and $\mathcal{O}_Y$, and one can readily check that they are finite-dimensional.

The non-cyclic module $\mathcal{V}_1 \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}\mathcal{V}$ is self-dual. Namely, the following $*$-linear involution

$$\psi(\mathcal{E}_b\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}) \ = \ q^{-(b_\sharp\,,\,b_\sharp)/2+(\rho_k\,,\,\rho_k)/2}\mathcal{E}_b\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} \ \text{ for } \ b \in B \tag{8.2}$$

corresponds to $\varepsilon$ from the double Hecke algebra. It is formula (5.8) from [C5], which is equivalent to (4.25) above. Remark that the module $\mathcal{V}_1$ is not $PGL_2^c(\mathbf{Z})$-invariant because any extension of the automorphism

$\tau_+$ has to be proportional to the multiplication by $\tilde{\gamma}(X)$, which does not preserve $\mathcal{V}_1$.

*Gaussians.* We turn to the Gaussians in $V_{\text{sph}}[\xi]$, which will be called *restricted Gaussians.* Generally speaking, the problem is to make $\tau_+$ an inner automorphism. The analysis is not difficult thanks to the main theorem of Section 6. The Gaussian commutes with $X$-operators, so preserves the $X$-eigenspaces. This theorem provides their description. The Gaussian, if it exists, has to be an element (a function) in spherical representations, not only an operator, because the $X$-action makes these representations algebras. So this case is especially interesting.

According to the main theorem, $\tau_+$ is inner in $V = V_{\text{sph}}[\xi]$ if and only if the map

$$S^{\xi}_{\hat{w}} \mapsto \tau_+(S^{\xi}_{\hat{w}}), \ \text{ where } \ \hat{w} \in \hat{W}^{\flat}_*[\xi] \ \text{ and } \ S^{\xi}_{\hat{w}} = S_{\hat{w}}(q^{\xi}), \tag{8.3}$$

is inner (i.e. multiplication by a matrix) in the eigenspace $V(\xi)$. In the spherical case, $S_{\hat{w}}$ become simply $\hat{w}$ in the realization $\mathfrak{F}'[\xi]$, and the automorphisms $\tau_+(\hat{w})$ can be readily calculated. We come to the following proposition.

**Proposition 8.1.** *The restricted Gaussian defined by the relations*

$$\gamma\, H\, \gamma^{-1} \ = \ \tau_+(H) \ \textit{in } V \tag{8.4}$$

*exists in $V = \mathfrak{F}'[\xi]$ if and only if*

$$q^{(b,b+2\xi)/2} \ = \ 1 \ \textit{whenever} \ \ bw \in \hat{W}^{\flat}_*[\xi] \ \ \textit{for} \ \ b \in B, \ w \in W. \tag{8.5}$$

*Then it is proportional to $\gamma_*(bw) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} q^{(b+2w(\xi),b)/2}$.*

*Proof.* Let $v$ be the cyclic generator of $V$ (of weight $\xi$). We identify $\gamma$ with the operator of multiplication by $\gamma$. If it exists then

$$\gamma(S_{\hat{w}}(v)) \ = \ S_{\hat{w}}(S_{\hat{w}}^{-1}\gamma S_{\hat{w}})(v) \text{ for all } \hat{w} \in \Upsilon_+[\xi]. \tag{8.6}$$

Here $\gamma'_{\hat{w}} = S_{\hat{w}}^{-1}\gamma S_{\hat{w}}\gamma^{-1}$ is a function which can be readily calculated due to the definition of $\tau_+$. However it is more convenient to involve $\mathfrak{F}'[\xi]$, where $S_{\hat{w}}$ is nothing else but $\hat{w}$. Recall that $\tau_+$ is interpreted as the formal conjugation by $\gamma(q^z) = q^{(z,z)/2}$ in any functional spaces. See (4.22) and (4.28). Therefore

$$\gamma'_{\hat{w}}(\hat{u}) \ = \ q^{(\xi'',\xi'')/2-(\xi',\xi')/2} \ \text{ for } \ \xi' = \hat{u}(\!(\xi)\!), \ \xi'' = \hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!). \tag{8.7}$$

Its action on $v$ is $\gamma'_{\hat{w}}(\text{id}) = \gamma_*(\hat{w})$.

Thanks to the argument which has been used several times, formula (8.6) defines $\gamma$ correctly if and only if $\gamma'_{\hat{w}} = 1$ for $\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\xi]$. This is exactly (8.5). $\square$

**Perfect representations.** Following the same lines, let us find out when $V = V_{\text{sph}}[\xi]$ is self-dual i.e. $\varepsilon$ can be made an inner involution in $V$. For the sake of simplicity, we use the functional realization of $\mathfrak{F}'[\xi]$ of $V$. So 1 is the spherical vector, $\delta_0 = \delta_{\text{id}}$ is the $X$-cyclic generator, $\delta_0 = \delta_{\text{id}}$.

Recall that

$$\chi_{\hat{w}}(\hat{u}) \ = \ \delta_{\hat{w},\hat{u}}, \ \ \delta_{\hat{w}}(\hat{u}) \ = \ \mu_{\bullet}(\hat{w})^{-1}\chi_{\hat{w}} \tag{8.8}$$

for the Kronecker $\delta_{\hat{w},\hat{u}}$. We also set $\delta^{\pi}_{b} = \delta_{\pi_b}$ in the case $\xi = -\rho_k$.

**Theorem 8.2.** *i) Provided (7.7), the finite-dimensional representation $V_{sph}[\xi]$ is self-dual if and only if it is $X$-unitary and $q^{-\rho_k} = q^{\hat{w}(\!(\xi)\!)}$ for a certain $\hat{w} \in \Upsilon_+[\xi]$. The representation $V_{sph}[-\rho_k]$, is $\mathcal{H}\!\!\mathcal{H}^{\flat}$-isomorphic to the irreducible $X$-cospherical $Y$-semisimple nonzero quotient of $\mathcal{I}_Y[\rho_k]$, which is unique. The $X$-spectrum of $V_{sph}[\xi]$, which is $\Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$, belongs to $\pi_B = \{\pi_b \mid b \in B\}$ and is the negative of its $Y$-spectrum. The $X$-unitary structure of $V_{sph}[-\rho_k]$ is also $Y$-unitary.*

*ii) The module $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k] \simeq V_{sph}[-\rho_k]$ has a basis formed by the discretizations of the spherical polynomials $\mathcal{E}_b$ :*

$$\mathcal{E}'_b(\hat{w}) \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathcal{E}_b(q^{-\hat{w}(\!(\rho_k)\!)}) \ \ \textit{for} \ \ \hat{w} \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]. \tag{8.9}$$

*They are well defined assuming that $\pi_b \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$. Explicitly,*

$$\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k] \ = \ \oplus_{b^\bullet}\, \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\, \mathcal{E}'_{b^\bullet},$$

*where the summation is over the set of representatives*

$$\pi_{b^\bullet} \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]/\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\rho_k] \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \Upsilon'_+[-\rho_k].$$

*Here we use that $\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[-\rho_k] = \hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\rho_k]$. Moreover*

$$\mathcal{E}'_b = \mathcal{E}'_c \ \textit{whenever} \ \pi_b(\!(\rho_k)\!) \ = \pi_c(\!(\rho_k)\!), \ \textit{i.e.} \ \pi_b^{-1}\pi_c \in \hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\rho_k]. \tag{8.10}$$

*iii) The map*

$$\psi' : \sum g_b \mathcal{E}'_b \mapsto \sum g^*_b \delta^{\pi}_b \ \ \textit{for} \ \ g_b \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}, \ \pi_b \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k], \tag{8.11}$$

*is an* $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$*-automorphism of* $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$, *inducing* $\varepsilon$ *on* $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$. *Here* $\delta_b^\pi$ *depend only on the images of* $\pi_b$ *in* $\Upsilon'_+[-\rho_k]$. *Equivalently,*

$$\langle 1\rangle'\,\psi'(f)\,(\pi_b) \;=\; \langle \mathcal{E}'_b\,,\,f\rangle' \;=\; \langle\, f^*\,\mathcal{E}'_b\,\rangle',$$

$$\text{where }\ \langle f\rangle' \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum_{\hat w\in\Upsilon'_+[-\rho_k]} \mu_\bullet(\hat w) f(\hat w). \tag{8.12}$$

*Proof.* The condition $q^{-\rho_k}=q^{\hat w((\xi))}$ is necessary because $\varepsilon$ sends $X_b$ to $Y_b$, conjugating the eigenvalues, and the self-duality implies that $\mathrm{Spec}_X = -\mathrm{Spec}_Y$. So if the involution of $V$, let us denote it by $\psi'$, exists then $\psi'(1)$ has to be proportional to $\delta_0$. Its $X$-weight is $-\rho_k$. Here we use the $\mathfrak{F}'$-realization of $V$. Recall that the $Y$-weight of 1 is $\rho_k$.

Now let $\xi=-\rho_k$ and

$$\Upsilon_0[\rho_k] \,\supset\, \Upsilon_-[\rho_k] \,\subset\, \Upsilon_+[\rho_k]. \tag{8.13}$$

It is a reformulation of (7.7) using the obvious relations $\Upsilon_\pm[\xi]=\Upsilon_\mp[-\xi]$. We know how to describe nonzero irreducible $Y$-semisimple quotients of $\mathcal{I}_Y[\rho_k]$. The latter module has such quotients thanks to (8.13) and Theorem 6.1. The universal semisimple quotient is $U_Y[\rho_k] \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \mathcal{H}^\flat_X/\mathcal{J}$ for

$$\mathcal{J} \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \sum \mathcal{H}_X\cdot\tau_+\big(\Phi_{\hat w}(q^{-\rho_k})\big), \tag{8.14}$$

where the summation is over $\hat w\in\ddot{\Upsilon}_+[-\rho_k]$ and 1 is identified with the cyclic generator of $\mathcal{I}_Y[\rho_k]$. Using Theorem 7.3, we get that $U_Y[\rho_k]$ has a unique nonzero irreducible $X$-cospherical quotient. This implies that the latter is a unique irreducible $X$-cospherical quotient of $\mathcal{I}_Y[\rho_k]$. Cf. Lemma 6.2 from [C1]. We will denote it by $V^Y_{\mathrm{sph}}[\rho_k]$.

Let us check that the module $V_{\mathrm{sph}}[-\rho_k]\simeq\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ is not only $Y$-cosherical but also $X$-cospherical. Since it is irreducible, we need to find a vector $v$ satisfying (7.1):

$$T_i(v)=t_i\,v\ \text{ for }\ i>0,\ X_a(v)=q^{-(a\,,\,\rho_k)}v\ \text{ for }\ a\in B. \tag{8.15}$$

Such $v$ is exactly the generator $\delta_0$. Note that the first formula in (8.15) holds because $\{s_1,\ldots,s_n\}\subset\ddot{\Upsilon}_+[-\rho_k]$.

Summarizing, the $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-homomorphism $\mathcal{I}_Y[\rho_k]\to\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ sending $1\mapsto 1$, which exists because the former module is induced, identifies the latter with $V^Y_{\mathrm{sph}}[\rho_k]$ constructed above. There are several immediate corollaries.

First, the operators $Y_a$ are diagonalizable in $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$. Second, the $Y$-spectrum is simple and coincides with the negative of the $X$-spectrum. Third, the invariant $Y$-definite $*$-bilinear form on $V^Y_{\text{sph}}[\rho_k]$ has to be proportional to the $X$-definite invariant form on $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ upon this identification. Fourth, the polynomials $\mathcal{E}_b \in \mathcal{V}$ are well defined for $\pi_b \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$. Let us check the latter claim.

Using the standard $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$-homomorphism from $\mathcal{V}$ to $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ and the simplicity of the $Y$-spectrum of the target, we diagonalize the $Y$-operators in the subspaces

$$\Sigma(b) \ = \ \oplus_{c\succ b}\, \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}X_c \,\oplus\, \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}X_b, \ \text{ for } \ B \ni c \succ b, \tag{8.16}$$

starting with $b=0$ and "decreasing" $b$ as far as $\pi_b \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$. See (3.4). The leading monomial $X_b$ always contributes to $E_b$. Thus the Macdonald polynomials $\{E_b\}$ are well defined in this range and their images $E'_b$ in $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ are nonzero. Let us verify that $E_b(q^{-\rho_k}) \neq 0$ for such $b$.

Following [C3,C4], we set

$$\begin{aligned} [\![f,g]\!] \ &= \ \{L_{\imath(f)}(g(x))\}(q^{-\rho_k}) \ \text{ for } \ f,g \in \mathcal{V}, \\ \imath(X_b) \ &= \ X_{-b} \ = \ X_b^{-1}, \ \imath(z) \ = \ z \ \text{ for } \ z \in \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{8.17}$$

where $L_f$ is from Proposition 3.1. Let us introduce the following $\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}$-linear anti-involution of $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$

$$\nabla \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \varepsilon\star = \star\varepsilon : \ X_b \mapsto Y_b^{-1}, \ T_i \mapsto T_i \ (1 \le i \le n). \tag{8.18}$$

The basis of all duality statements is the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.3.** *For arbitrary nonzero* $q, t_{sht}, t_{lng}$,

$$[\![f,g]\!] = [\![g,f]\!] \ \text{ and } \ [\![H(f),g]\!] = [\![f, H^\nabla(g)]\!], \ H \in \mathcal{HH}^\flat. \tag{8.19}$$

*The quotient* $\mathcal{V}'$ *of* $\mathcal{V}$ *by the radical* $Rad[\![\,,\,]\!]$ *of the pairing* $[\![\ ,\ ]\!]$ *is an* $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$*-module such that a) all* $Y$*-eigenspaces* $\mathcal{V}'_Y(\xi)$ *are zero or one-dimensional, b)* $E(q^{-\rho_k}) \neq 0$ *if the image* $E'$ *of* $E$ *in* $\mathcal{V}'$ *is a nonzero* $Y$*-eigenvector.*

*Proof.* Formulas (8.19) are from Theorem 2.2 of [C4]. See also [C1], Corollary 5.4. Thus $\text{Rad}[\![\,,\,]\!]$ is a submodule and the form $[\![\ ,\ ]\!]$ is well defined and nondegenerate on $\mathcal{V}'$. For any pullback $E \in \mathcal{V}$ of $E' \in \mathcal{V}'$, $E(q^{-\rho_k}) = [\![E,1]\!] = [\![E',1']\!]$. If $E'$ is a $Y$-eigenvector of weight $\xi$ and $E(q^{-\rho_k})$ vanishes then

$$[\![\mathcal{Y}^\flat(E'), \mathcal{H}^\flat_Y(1')]\!] = 0 = [\![E', \mathcal{V}\cdot\mathcal{H}^\flat_Y(1')]\!] \ \text{ for } \ \mathcal{Y}^\flat = \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}[Y_b].$$

Therefore $\llbracket E', \mathcal{V}' \rrbracket = 0$, which is impossible.

We can use it to check that $\dim \mathcal{V}'_Y[\xi] \le 1$. Indeed, there is always a linear combination of two eigenvectors in $\mathcal{V}'$ of the same weight with zero value at $q^{-\rho_k}$, which has to be zero identically. $\square$

Let us go back to the proof of the theorem. Obviously the radical of the pairing $\llbracket\ ,\ \rrbracket$ belongs to the kernel of the discretization map $\delta' : \mathcal{V} \to \mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$. Since the latter module is irreducible, the radical and the kernel coincide, and we have a nondegenerate pairing on $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ inducing $\triangledown$ on $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$. Since the image of $E_b$ in this module is nonzero for $\pi_b \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$, we conclude that $E_b(q^{-\rho_k}) \neq 0$ and the spherical polynomials $\mathcal{E}_b = E_b/(E_b(q^{-\rho_k}))$ are well defined for such $b$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{E}_b$ and $\mathcal{E}_c$ are well defined and their eigenvalues coincide then they can be different in $\mathcal{V}$ but their images in $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ have to coincide thanks to the normalization $\mathcal{E}_b(q^{-\rho_k}) = 1$.

So far we have not used the $X$-unitary structure at all. By the way, if it exists then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E_b(q^{-\rho_k}) \ = \ 0 \ \Rightarrow \ (\, E'_b\, ,\, \delta_0\, ) \ = \ 0 \ \Rightarrow \\
& (\, Y_a(E'_b)\, ,\, T_i X_c(\delta_0)\, ) = 0 \ \text{ for } \ i > 0,\ a, c \in B \Rightarrow \\
& (\, E'_b\, ,\, Y_a^{-1} T_i X_c(\delta_0)\, ) \ = \ 0 \ \Rightarrow \ (\, E'_b\, ,\, \mathcal{HH}^\flat(\delta_0)\, ) \ = \ 0 \ \Rightarrow \\
& (\, E'_b\, ,\, \mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]\, ) \ = \ 0 \Rightarrow E'_b = 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.20}
$$

The existence of an $X$-unitary structure, i.e. the relation $\mu_\bullet(\hat{w}) = 1$ for $\hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]$, is equivalent to the existence of $\psi'$. Indeed, the form $(f, g) = \llbracket \psi(f), \psi(g) \rrbracket$ is obviously invariant pseudo-hermitian, assuming that $\psi$ induces $\varepsilon$, and the other way round. Recall that by invariant pseudo-hermitian forms, we mean $\star$-invariant $*$-skew-symmetric nondegenerate forms. As we already used, such a form is automatically $X$-definite because the $X$-eigenspaces of $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ are one-dimensional. It is equally applicable to $Y$ instead of $X$.

Recall that we do not suppose $X$-definite or $Y$-definite forms to be positive (or negative) hermitian forms.

If $\mu_\bullet = 1$ on $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]$, then the delta-functions $\delta^\pi_b$ depend only on the classes of $\pi_b$ modulo the latter group. Hence, the map $\psi'$ from iii) is a well defined restriction of $\psi_\circ$ from formula (4.11). It induces $\varepsilon$ on $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$ (Theorem 4.2) and

$$
\mathcal{E}_b(X) \ = \ \varepsilon(G_{\pi_b})(1) \ \text{ for } \ b \in B. \tag{8.21}
$$

The latter holds until the elements $\pi_b$ sit in $\Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$. $\square$

Let us combine together all the structures discussed above. Our aim is to describe finite-dimensional irreducible self-dual semisimple pseudo-unitary representation with the action of $PGL_2^c(\mathbf{Z})$. We call them *perfect.*

**Corollary 8.4.** *i) A self-dual spherical $X, Y$-semisimple pseudo-unitary irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H\!H}^\flat$ is finite-dimensional and possesses an $X$-eigenvector of weight $-\rho_k$ and a $Y$-eigenvector of weight $\rho_k$. It exists if and only if*

$$\Upsilon_0[-\rho_k] \supset \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k] \subset \Upsilon_-[-\rho_k],\ |\,\Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]\,| \le \infty,$$
$$\text{and } \ \mu_\bullet(\hat{w}) = 1 \ \text{ for } \ \hat{w} \in \hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]. \tag{8.22}$$

*There is only one such representation up to isomorphisms, namely, $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$.*

*ii) It is $PGL_2^c(\mathbf{Z})$-invariant if and only it contains the restricted Gaussian*

$$\gamma_*(\pi_b) \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} q^{(b-2u_b^{-1}(\rho_k)\,,\,b)/2} \ \text{ for } \ b_\sharp = b - u_b^{-1}(\rho_k),$$

*which means the relations*

$$q^{(b,b-2\rho_k)/2} \ = \ 1 \text{ for } \ \text{all } \ \pi_b \in \hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]. \tag{8.23}$$

*In this case, $\tau_+$ corresponds to the multiplication by $\gamma_*$, and $\psi'$ from (8.11) is proportional to the involution of $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ sending*

$$\mathcal{E}'_b\gamma^{-1} \ \mapsto \ \gamma_*(\pi_b)^{-1}\,\mathcal{E}'_b\gamma_*^{-1}, \ \ \text{where } \ \pi_b \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]\,. \tag{8.24}$$

*Proof.* Only the last formula requires some comment. It is a straightforward specialization of (8.2). □

**Main examples.** The above corollary gives an approach to the classification of the triples $\{q, t, B \subset P\}$ such that $\mathcal{H\!H}^\flat$ possesses a perfect representation, i.e. a finite-dimensional nonzero irreducible self-dual semisimple pseudo-unitary representation with the action of $PGL_2^c(\mathbf{Z})$. If it exists then this representation is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$. The importance of these representations is obvious. They carry all properties of the classical Fourier transform, directly generalizing the *truncated Bessel functions* considered in [CM], the Verlinde algebras, and irreducible representations of the Weyl algebras at roots of unity. Here we will discuss only two "main sectors" of perfect representations, negative (generic $q$) and positive (roots of unity), where the description of

$k$ is reasonably simple. The case of $A_1$ is considered in detail in [C7] and [CO] including the explicit formulas for the Gauss-Selberg sums.

**Theorem 8.5.** *i) In notation from Theorem 5.3, let us impose a somewhat stronger variant of condition (5.20), assuming that $q$ is generic and*

$$(8.25)\quad (\rho_k,\alpha^\vee) \;\not\in\; \mathbf{Z}\setminus\{0\} \text{ for all } \alpha\in R_+,$$
$$h_\alpha(k)=(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+k_\alpha \;\not\in\; \mathbf{Z} \text{ for all extreme } \alpha\neq\vartheta,\; h_\vartheta(k)\in\; -\mathbf{N}.$$

*For instance, we may pick $k_{lng}=k_{sht}=-e/h$, where $(e,h)=1$ for $e\in\mathbf{N}$ and $h=(\rho,\vartheta)+1$ is the Coxeter number. Then $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ is perfect. It exists and remains perfect if $q$ is a root of unity, provided that $h_\vartheta(k)\geq -N$ and all fractional powers of $q$ which may appear in the formulas are primitive roots of unity of maximal possible order.*

*ii) Setting $e \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} -h_\vartheta(k)$,*

$$\hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k] \;=\; \{(e\omega_r)u_r^{-1}, \mid e\omega_r\in B,\, r\in O\}.$$

*Identifying $b$ upon the symmetries*

$$\pi_b\mapsto \pi_b\cdot u_r\cdot(e\omega_r),\ \text{ i.e. } b\mapsto b+eu_b^{-1}(\omega_r) \ \text{ for }\ (e\omega_r)\cdot u_r^{-1}\in \hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k],$$

$$(8.26)\qquad \mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k] \;=\; \sum_{b\in B}\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\delta^\pi_b,\ \text{ where either } b=0,$$
$$\text{or } (\vartheta,\rho_k)+k_\vartheta-(b_-,\vartheta)<0,\ \text{ or}$$
$$(\vartheta,\rho_k)+k_\vartheta-(b_-,\vartheta)=0 \ \text{ and }\ u_b^{-1}(\vartheta)\in R_-.$$

*For example, let $\omega=\omega_1,\ k=k_{lng},\ e=-2k\in\mathbf{N},\ B=P$ in the case $R=A_1$. Then assumption (8.25) means that $e$ is odd and*

$$\hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]=\{\pi_0,\pi_{e\omega}\},\ \mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]=\sum_{j=0}^{e-1}\mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\,\delta^\pi_{-j\omega}.$$

*The proof* is close to that of Theorem 5.3. The explicit description of the set $\Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$ is nothing else but the definition (6.7).

Let $bw\in\hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]$. See (6.3) and (6.10). Then $bw((\rho_k))=w(\rho_k)+b=\rho_k,\ w\in W,\, b\in B$. Setting $\beta=w^{-1}(\alpha_i)$ for $1\leq i\leq n$,

$$(w(\rho_k)-\rho_k\,,\,\alpha_i^\vee)=(\rho_k\,,\,\beta^\vee)-k_\beta=-(b,\alpha_i^\vee)\in\mathbf{Z}.$$

If $\beta>0$ then there exists a simple root $\alpha_j$ of the same length as $\beta$ such that $\beta^\vee-\alpha_j^\vee$ is a positive coroot. Hence $\beta=\alpha_j$ thanks to the first condition in (8.25). Similarly, $\beta$ can be negative only for extreme $-\beta$. However it contradicts the second condition unless $\beta = -\vartheta$. We see that $w$ preserves the set $\{-\vartheta, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$ and is $u_r^{-1}$ for certain $r \in O$. We get that

$$b = \rho_k - u_r^{-1}(\rho_k) = e\omega_r \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{e\omega_r} = (e\omega_r) \cdot u_r^{-1}.$$

Indeed,

$$(b, \alpha_i) = 0 \;\Leftrightarrow\; u_r(\alpha_i) \neq -\vartheta \;\Leftrightarrow\; i \neq r, \;\; (b, \alpha_r) = -h_\vartheta(k).$$

There is an additional condition to check, namely, (8.26) for $b_- = -e\omega_{r^*}$ and $u_r$ :

$$(e\omega_{r^*}, \vartheta) < e, \;\text{ or }\; \{\, (e\omega_{r^*}, \vartheta) = e \;\text{ and }\; u_r^{-1}(\vartheta) \in R_- \,\}.$$

Since $(\omega_{r^*}, \vartheta) = 1$, only the second relation may happen. It holds because $u_r^{-1}(\vartheta) = -\alpha_r$.

Now let us establish the existence of the pseudo-unitary structure, which is equivalent to the relations $\mu_\bullet(\pi_{e\omega_r}) = 1$. Thanks to Proposition 6.8, only $A_{4l-1}$ and $D_{2l+1}$ have to be examined. In other cases, the orders of the elements of $bw \in \hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]$ are not divisible by 4. The proof below is actually uniform but the calculation is more relaxed in the simply-laced case.

Letting $k = k_{\mathrm{lng}}$, the integer $e = -kh$ has to be relatively prime to $h$ and, in particular, must be odd. Recall that $r \mapsto r^*$ for $r \in O$ describes the inversion in $\Pi$ and corresponds to the automorphism of the nonaffine Dynkin diagram induced by $\varsigma = -w_0$. We will use (5.22):

$$\mu_\bullet(\pi_b) \;=\; \prod\Big(\frac{t_\alpha^{-1/2} - t_\alpha^{1/2} q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\rho_k)+j}}{t_\alpha^{1/2} - t_\alpha^{-1/2} q_\alpha^{(\alpha^\vee,\rho_k)+j}}\Big) \;\text{ for }\; \alpha \in R_+, \tag{8.27}$$

$$-(b_-, \alpha^\vee) > j > 0 \;\text{ if }\; u_b^{-1}(\alpha) \in R_-, \; -(b_-, \alpha^\vee) \geq j > 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

In the simply-laced case, $t_\alpha = t, \; q_\alpha = q, \; \alpha^\vee = \alpha$. Let $b = e\omega_r$.

One has $-(b_-, \alpha^\vee) = e(\omega_{r^*}, \alpha) = e$ when $\alpha$ contains $\alpha_{r^*}$, and $= 0$ otherwise. Using that the total number of factors here is even, namely $2 * (e-1) * (\rho, \omega_{r^*})$, we may transpose the binomials in the numerator:

$$\mu_\bullet(\pi_{e\omega_r}) = \prod_{(\omega_{r^*},\alpha)=1}^{1<j<e} q^{2(\alpha,\rho_k)+2j} \Big(\frac{t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2} q^{-(\alpha,\rho_k)-j}}{t^{1/2} - t^{-1/2} q^{(\alpha,\rho_k)+j}}\Big). \tag{8.28}$$

Here $j < e$ because $j = e$ may appear only under the condition $u_r^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$, which never holds. Indeed, let $\alpha = \alpha_{r^*} + \beta$ where $\beta$

doesn't contain $\alpha_{r^*}$. Then $u_r^{-1}(\alpha_{r^*}+\beta) = -\vartheta+\beta'$ for $\beta'$ without $\alpha_r$. Since $\vartheta$ contains all simple roots, we conclude that $-\vartheta+\beta'$ is always negative.

As a by-product, we have established that $-u_r^{-1}$, sending

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Lambda \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \{\alpha>0,\, (\alpha,\omega_{r^*})=1\} \ni \alpha \,\mapsto \\
&\alpha' = -u_r^{-1}(\alpha) \in \{\alpha'>0,\, (\alpha',\omega_r)=1\} \overset{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} \Lambda',
\end{aligned} \tag{8.29}$$

is an isomorphism. Its inverse takes

$$(\alpha,\rho_k) \mapsto (-u_r(\alpha),\rho_k) = -(\alpha,u_r^{-1}(\rho_k)) = (\alpha, e\omega_r-\rho_k) = e-(\alpha,\rho_k).$$

Since the sets $\Lambda$ and $\Lambda'$ are isomorphic under the automorphism $\varsigma$ the sets $\{(\alpha,\rho_k)\}$ and $\{(\alpha',\rho_k)\}$ coincide for $\alpha\in\Lambda$ and $\alpha'\in\Lambda'$. Finally, we conclude that $(\alpha,\rho_k)\mapsto e-(\alpha,\rho_k)$ is a symmetry of $\Lambda=\Lambda'$.

It ensures a complete cancelation of the binomials in (8.28) and results in

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_\bullet(\pi_{e\omega_r}) \;&=\; q^{2\Sigma},\ \Sigma = \sum_{\alpha\in\Lambda, 1<j<e} ((\alpha,\rho_k)+j) \\
&=\; (e-1)hk(\omega_{r^*},\rho) + (e(e-1)/2)(2(\omega_{r^*},\rho)) \;=\; 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.30}$$

We have used that $hk=e$, $|\Lambda| = 2(\omega_{r^*},\rho)$, and the following general formula

$$\sum_{\alpha>0}(a,\alpha)(b,\alpha^\vee) \;=\; h(a,b),\ a,b\in \mathbf{C}^n.$$

Therefore $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ is pseudo-unitary.

The last check is (8.23), ensuring the existence of the restricted Gaussian in this module:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\omega_r, e\omega_r-2\rho_k)/2 \;&=\; (\omega_r, -u_r^{-1}(\rho_k)-\rho_k)/2 \\
&= -(\omega_r+u_r(\omega_r),\rho_k)/2 \;=\; -(\omega_{r^*}-\omega_r,\rho_k)/2 = 0, \\
&\text{where } \ \{(e\omega_r)\cdot u_r^{-1}\} \;=\; \hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k].
\end{aligned} \tag{8.31}$$

Once again we have used that the automorphism $\varsigma=-w_0$ transposes $\omega_r$ and $\omega_{r^*}$ and preserves $\rho_k$.

The analysis of the case of $A_1$ is straightforward, as well as the statement about roots of unity. □

It is instructional to calculate the dimension of $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$. For the sake of simplicity let $B=Q$. We combine (8.26) with formula (1.20) applied to $z \in (1/e)Q$, which gives the existence and uniqueness of $u \in W$, $a \in Q$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &z_- \overset{\textbf{def}}{=\!=} ua(\!(z)\!) \in (1/e)P_-,\ (z_-,\vartheta) \geq -1, \\ &(z_-,\vartheta) = -1 \ \Rightarrow\ u^{-1}(\vartheta) \in R_-,\ \text{and} \\ &(\alpha_i, z_-) = 0 \ \Rightarrow\ u^{-1}(\alpha_i) \in R_+,\ i > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{8.32}$$

Multiplying $z$ and $a$ by $e$, we get that the elements $b$ from (8.26) are in one-to-one correspondence with the elements of $Q/eQ$. So the dimension is $e^n$.

There is an immediate proof of this formula based on formula (6.23). Indeed, it gives that the dimension is the volume of the domain $\{z \in \mathbf{R}^n\}$ such that $(z, \alpha_i) \leq 0$ for $i > 0$ and $(z, \vartheta) \geq -e$ divided by the volume of the affine Weyl chamber.

*Roots of unity.* Let $q$ be a $N$-th root of unity under assumption (7.10). See also (6.28). However we do not assume now that fractional powers of $q$ which appear in the formulas are primitive roots of unity unless otherwise stated.

We are going to describe the main "positive" sector of perfect $\mathcal{H}^\flat$-modules, generalizing the Verlinde algebras. In this case $k_{\text{lng}}$ and $k_{\text{sht}}$ are positive and rational. To simplify considerations, we will assume that $N$ is greater than the Coxeter number, but this is actually not necessary. Perfect representations below are well defined for small $N$. To see one can follow the proof of the previous theorem instead of using the affine Weyl chambers (see below).

There exist other sectors, for instance, with negative $h_\vartheta(k)$ (see the above theorem) and with more special choices of the roots of unity. The complete list remains unknown, although Corollary 8.4 seems sufficient for the classification.

We pick

$$\hat{q} = q^{1/(2\hat{m})} \ \text{ for } \ (B, B + 2\rho_k) \ = \ \hat{m}^{-1}\mathbf{Z}$$

setting

$$q^{(b,c+2\rho_k)} \ = \ \hat{q}^{\,(b,c+2\rho_k)\hat{m}}$$

unless stated otherwise. Note that $\hat{q}$ is not supposed to be primitive.

**Theorem 8.6.** *i) We assume that* $k_{lng}, k_{sht} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} (8.33)\qquad & \mathbf{N} \ni h_{\vartheta}(k) = (\rho_k, \vartheta) + k_{sht} \ < \ N_{sht} = N, \\ & \textit{and also either (a) } (N, \nu_{lng}) = 1, \textit{ or} \\ & \textit{(b) } \mathbf{N} \ni h_{\theta}(k) = (\rho_k, \theta^{\vee}) + k_{lng} \ < \ N_{lng} = N/(N, \nu_{lng}) \\ & \textit{for the longest root } \theta \in R_+, \textit{ or} \\ & \textit{(c) } (\rho_k, \alpha^{\vee}) \ \notin \ \mathbf{Z}_+ \textit{ for all long } \alpha \in R_+. \end{aligned}$$

*In case (c), we suppose that* $\hat{q}$ *is a primitive root of unity. Then relation (7.7) holds, which guarantees the existence of the* $Y$*-cospherical* $X$*-semisimple finite-dimensional irreducible module* $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$*. It is nonzero if* $h_{\vartheta}(k) - N \leq \ Max(B_-, \vartheta)$*. In case (b), we also add here the counterpart of this inequality for* $\theta$*.*

*ii) We also impose either the condition*

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\rho \in B,\ h_{\vartheta}(k) + h - 1 \leq N,\ h_{\theta}(k) + h - 1 < N_{lng}\} \textit{ or} \\ (8.34)\quad & \{\rho \notin B,\ h_{\vartheta}(k) + h - 1 \leq N + 1,\ h_{\theta}(k) + h - 1 < N_{lng} + 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Only the relations with* $\vartheta$ *are necessary under conditions (a) or (c) from i). Then* $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ *is pseudo-unitary and*

(8.35)

$$\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\rho_k] = \{(e\omega_r)u_r^{-1} \ \mid \ e\omega_r \in B,\ q^{N(\omega_r, B)} = 1\}, \ \textit{as } e \stackrel{\mathbf{def}}{=\!=} N - h_{\vartheta}(k).$$

*It is positive unitary if* $q^{1/2} = \exp(\pi i/N)$*. The restricted Gaussian exists in* $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ *if and only*

$$q^{m_r} = \hat{q}^{\,2m_r\hat{m}} = 1 \ \textit{ for } \ m_r = (N - h_{\vartheta}(k))N(\omega_r, \omega_r)/2$$

*and* $\omega_r$ *from (8.35). This may restrict the choices for* $\hat{q}$*.*

*iii) Provided the conditions from i) and ii),*

$$\begin{aligned} (8.36)\qquad & \mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k] \ = \mathbf{Q}_{q,t} \oplus \sum_{0 \neq b \in B} \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\delta^{\pi}_{b}, \ \textit{where} \\ & \textit{(a) } h_{\vartheta}(k) - (b_-, \vartheta) < N, \ \textit{or} \\ & \quad \{h_{\vartheta}(k) - (b_-, \vartheta) = N \ \ \textit{and} \ \ u_b^{-1}(\vartheta) \in R_-\}, \quad \textit{and} \\ & \textit{(b) } h_{\theta}(k) - (b_-, \theta^{\vee}) < N_{lng}, \ \textit{or} \\ & \quad \{h_{\theta}(k) - (b_-, \theta^{\vee}) = N_{lng} \ \ \textit{and} \ \ u_b^{-1}(\theta) \in R_-\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Here we identify* $b$ *modulo* $\hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\rho_k]$ *:*

$$b \mapsto b + u_b^{-1}(c),\ b_- \mapsto u_c(b_-) + c_- \ \textit{ for } \ \pi_c \in \hat{W}^{\flat}_{*}[\rho_k].$$

*The space without this identification is also an* $\mathcal{HH}^\flat$*-module, which always contains the restricted Gaussian.*

*iv) For example, let*

$$\omega = \omega_1,\ k = k_{lng},\ e = N - 2k \in \mathbf{N},\ B = P$$

*in the case* $R = A_1$*. Then*

$$\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k] = \sum_{j=-e+1}^{e} \mathbf{Q}_{q,t}\, \delta^{\pi}_{j\omega} \text{ for primitive } q^{1/2}$$

*is perfect. It is positive unitary for* $q^{1/2} = \pm\exp(\pi i/N)$ *if* $k \in \mathbf{N}$; *the sign has to be plus for half-integral* $k$*. If* $k \in \mathbf{N}$ *and* $N$ *is odd we may pick* $q^{1/2}$ *in primitive* $N$*-th roots of unity. Then the summation above is over* $1 \le j \le e$*. The Gaussian exists in* $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ *in this case if either* $N = 4l + 3$ *for integral* $k$ *or* $k$ *is half-integral. This module is positive unitary for* $q^{1/2} = -\exp(\pi i/N)$*.*

*Proof.* The elements $\pi_b$ for $b$ satisfying (8.36) constitute the set $\Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$ due to the positivity of $k_\alpha$. Here we use that $\rho_k \in P_+$, $\vartheta$ is the maximal coroot, and $\theta^\vee$ is maximal among the short coroots. The positivity also results in the inequalities

$$(\rho_k, \alpha^\vee) - (b_-, \alpha) - \upsilon k_\alpha + \epsilon^b_\alpha < N_\alpha = N/(\nu_\alpha, N)$$

for the same $b$ and all $\alpha > 0$, where $\upsilon = 0, 1,\ \ \epsilon^b_\alpha = 1$ if $u_b^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$ and 0 otherwise. These inequalities are necessary and sufficient for the existence of $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$. Let us calculate the stabilizer $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]$.

**Lemma 8.7.** *Under the assumptions from ii), the group of the elements* $\pi_c$ *such that* $\Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]\pi_c = \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k]$ *is exactly* $\Pi = \{(e\omega_r)u_r^{-1}, r \in O\}$ *for* $e = N - h_\vartheta(k)$*.*

*Proof.* By definition, $\pi_c = cu_c^{-1}$ preserve the set of all element $b$ satisfying (8.36) under the mapping

$$b \mapsto b', \text{ where } \pi_b\pi_c = \pi_{b'},\ b' = b + u_b^{-1}(c),\ u_{b'} = u_c u_b.$$

The corresponding set of $b_-$ will be denoted by $B^N_-$. In terms of $b_-$ :

$$\pi_b\pi_c = u_b^{-1}b_- u_c^{-1}c_- = u_b^{-1}u_c^{-1}u_c(b_-)c_- = u_{b'}^{-1} \cdot (u_c(b_-) + c_-).$$

The element $b'_- = u_c(b_-) + c_-$ has to be from $B^N_-$. Using the affine action (1.17):

$$b_- \mapsto b'_- \ = \ c_- u_c(\!(b_-)\!) \ = \ u_c c(\!(b_-)\!). \tag{8.37}$$

Due to conditions (8.34) from part ii), either $-\rho \in B_-^N$ (it happens when $\rho \in B$) or $-\rho-\omega_r \in B_-^N$ for proper minuscule $\omega_r$ otherwise. Inner points of the segment connecting 0 and such $b_-$ in $\mathbf{R}^n$ are also inner in the polyhedron $\bar{B}_-^N \in \mathbf{R}^n$ which is defined by the same inequalities but for real $\bar{b}_-$. The set of its inner points is either $-e\mathfrak{C}_a$, where $e = N - h_\vartheta(k)$, $\mathfrak{C}_a$ is the affine Weyl chamber, or its intersection with the counterpart for $\theta$ and $N_{\text{lng}} - h_\theta(k)$ in case (b) from i). See (1.19) for the definition of the affine Weyl chamber and its basic properties.

We get that some points do not leave the negative Weyl chamber $-\mathfrak{C}_a$ under

$$z \mapsto e^{-1} u_c c(\!(\, ez \,)\!).$$

So do all points. The stabilizer of $-\mathfrak{C}_a = w_0(\mathfrak{C}_a)$ is $\{(-\omega_{r^*})u_{r^*}^{-1}\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} c_- u_c \ &= \ (-e\omega_{r^*})u_{r^*}^{-1} \ \text{ for } \ r \in O \ \text{ and } \ c_- \ = \ -e\omega_{r^*},\ u_c \ = \ u_{r^*}^{-1}, \\ \pi_c \ &= \ u_c^{-1} c_- \ = \ u_{r^*} \cdot (-e\omega_{r^*}) \ = \ (e\omega_r)u_r^{-1},\ c \ = \ e\omega_r. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

The elements $\pi_c \in \hat{W}_*^\flat[\rho_k]$ satisfy the conditions of the lemma. See (6.3) and (6.10). The definition is as follows:

$$\hat{W}^\flat[\rho] \ = \ \{\hat{w} \in \Upsilon_+[-\rho_k],\ q^{(\hat{w}((\rho_k))-\rho_k\,,\,b)} = 1 \text{ for all } b \in B\}. \tag{8.38}$$

Setting $\hat{w} = (e\omega_r)u_r^{-1}$,

$$\hat{w}(\!(\rho_k)\!) - \rho_k = u_r^{-1}(\rho_k) - \rho_k + e\omega_r = h_\vartheta(k)\omega_r + e\omega_r = N\omega_r.$$

Cf. the proof of the previous theorem. Hence $q^{N(\omega_r,b)}$ has to be 1 for all $b \in B$. We arrive at the conditions from ii). Now we can simply follow Theorem 8.5, formulas (8.30) and (8.31), to check the existence of the pseudo-unitary structure and the restricted Gaussian.

The claim about the positivity of the pairing for the "smallest" root of unity $q^{1/2} = \pm\exp(\pi i/N)$ is straightforward too. We represent the binomials in formula (8.28) for $\mu_\bullet$ in the form $(e^{ix} - e^{-ix})$ and use inequalities (8.36). In the numerator, the $x$ do not reach $\pi$ and $e^{ix} - e^{-ix} = ic$ for positive numbers $c$. Therefore the same holds true in the denominator. $\square$

As an application, we get a counterpart of Theorem 5.1 at roots of unity. Namely

$$\langle \mathcal{E}'_b\,(\mathcal{E}'_c)^*\,\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle'_\sharp \;=\; q^{-(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2-(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2+(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\mathcal{E}_c(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle'_\sharp, \tag{8.39}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{E}'_b\,\mathcal{E}'_c\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle'_\sharp \;&=\; q^{-(b_\sharp,b_\sharp)/2-(c_\sharp,c_\sharp)/2+(\rho_k,\rho_k)}\\ &\times\prod_\nu t_\nu^{l_\nu(w_0)/2}T_{w_0}^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_c)(q^{b_\sharp})\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle'_\sharp.\end{aligned} \tag{8.40}$$

Here $\langle f\mu_\bullet\rangle'_\sharp$ is the sum $\sum f\mu_\bullet(\pi_b)$ over $\{\pi_b\}$ for $b$ satisfying (8.36) upon the identification modulo $\hat{W}^\flat_*[\rho_k]$. The functions $\mathcal{E}'_b, \mathcal{E}'_c$ are the images of the polynomials $\mathcal{E}_b, \mathcal{E}_c$ in $\mathfrak{F}'[-\rho_k]$ for $b, c$ satisfying the same constraint. They are well defined and nonzero. See Theorem 8.2.

Concerning the generalized Gauss-Selberg sums $\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet\rangle'_\sharp$, the formulas can be obtained using the shift operators, which we do not discuss in the paper. See [C6] about integral $k$ and [C7] with the complete list of formulas for $A_1$. Generally speaking, the shift operator can be used as follows.

Given $k$, first we calculate $\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet^\kappa\rangle'_\sharp$ for $\varkappa = \{\varkappa_{\text{sht}}, \varkappa_{\text{lng}}\}$ taken from the sets $k_{\text{sht}} + \mathbf{Z}$ and $k_{\text{lng}} + \mathbf{Z}$ with the simplest possible perfect representations. We denote the corresponding $\mu$ by $\mu^\varkappa$. If $k$ are fractional we take $\varkappa$ negative and use the Macdonald identities from Section 5. Then we may apply the counterpart of (5.18):

$$\frac{\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet^k\rangle'_\sharp}{\langle\gamma\mu_\bullet^\varkappa\rangle'_\sharp} = \prod_{\alpha\in R_+}\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_k,\alpha^\vee)+j}}\Big)\Big(\frac{1-t_\alpha^{-1}q_\alpha^{(\rho_\varkappa,\alpha^\vee)+j}}{1-q_\alpha^{(\rho_\varkappa,\alpha^\vee)+j}}\Big). \tag{8.41}$$

## References

[Ao] K. Aomoto, On product formula for Jackson integrals associated with root systems, Preprint (1994).

[AI] R. Askey, and M.E.H. Ismail, *A generalization of ultraspherical polynomials*, in *Studies in Pure Mathematics* (ed. P. Erdös), Birkhäuser (1983), 55–78.

[Bi] J. Birman, *On Braid groups*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math., **22** (1969), 41–72.

[Bo] N. Bourbaki, *Groupes et algèbres de Lie*, Ch. **4**–**6**, Hermann, Paris (1969).

[C1] I. Cherednik, *Intertwining operators of double affine Hecke algebras*, Selecta Math. New ser. 3 (1997), 459–495

[C2] ______,*Double affine Hecke algebras and Macdonald's conjectures*, Annals of Mathematics 141 (1995), 191–216.

[C3] ______, *Macdonald's evaluation conjectures and difference Fourier transform*, Inventiones Math. 122 (1995),119–145.

[C4] ______, *Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials* , IMRN 10 (1995), 483–515.

[C5] ______, *Difference Macdonald-Mehta conjecture*, IMRN 10 (1997), 449–467.

[C6] ———, *From double Hecke algebra to analysis* , Doc.Math.J.DMV, Extra Volume ICM 1998,II, 527–531.

[C7] ———, *One-dimensional double Hecke algebras and Gaussian sums* , Duke Math. J. 108:3 (2001), 511–538.

[C8] ———, *Inverse Harish–Chandra transform and difference operators* IMRN 15 (1997), 733–750.

[C9] ———, *A new interpretation of Gelfand-Tzetlin bases* , Duke Math J., 54:2 (1987), 563–577.

[C10] ——— *On $q$-analogues of Riemann's zeta function* Sel.math., New ser. 7 (2001), 1–44.

[C11] ——— *On special bases of irreducible finite-dimensional representations of the degenerate affine Hecke algebra* Funct. Analysis Appl. 20 (1986), 87–89.

[CM] ———, and Y. Markov, *Hankel transform via double Hecke algebra* , CIME publications, 2001.

[CO] ———, and V. Ostrik, *From Double Hecke Algebras to Fourier Transform*, Selecta Math. (2002).

[Ch] K. Chandrasekharan, *Elliptic functions*, A series of Comprehensive Studies in Math. 281, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Tokyo (1985).

[DS] J.F. van Diejen, and J.V. Stokman, *Multivariable $q$-Racah polynomials.* Duke Math. J. 91 (1998), 89–136.

[D] C.F. Dunkl, *Hankel transforms associated to finite reflection groups*, Contemp. Math. 138 (1992), 123–138.

[Ev] R.J. Evans, *The evaluation of Selberg character sums*, L'Enseignement Math. 37 (1991), 235–248.

[J] M.F.E. de Jeu, *The Dunkl transform* , Invent. Math. 113 (1993), 147–162.

[HO1] G.J. Heckman, and E.M. Opdam, *Root systems and hypergeometric functions I*, Comp. Math. 64 (1987), 329–352.

[HO2] ———, and ——— *Harmonic analysis for affine Hecke algebras*, Preprint (1996).

[He] S. Helgason, *Groups and geometric analysis*, Academic Press, New York (1984).

[K] V.G. Kac, *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras* , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1990).

[KL1] D. Kazhdan, and G. Lusztig, *Proof of the Deligne-Langlands conjecture for Hecke algebras*, Invent.Math. 87 (1987), 153–215.

[KL2] D. Kazhdan, and G. Lusztig, *Tensor structures arising from affine Lie algebras. III,* J. of AMS 7 (1994), 335–381.

[Ki] A. Kirillov, Jr., *Inner product on conformal blocks and Macdonald's polynomials at roots of unity* , Preprint (1995).

[KnS] F. Knop, and S. Sahi, A recursion and a combinatorial formula for Jack polynomials, Inventions Math., (1997).

[KS] E. Koelink, and J. Stokman, *The big $q$-Jacobi function transform* , Publ. IRMA (Univ. Lois Pasteur), 1999/23 (1999).

[KK] B. Kostant, and S. Kumar, *T-Equivariant K-theory of generalized flag varieties*, J. Diff. Geometry 32 (1990), 549–603.

[L] G. Lusztig, Affine Hecke algebras and their graded version, J. of the AMS 2:3(1989), 599–685.

[M1] I.G. Macdonald, *Some conjectures for root systems*, SIAM J.Math. Anal. 13:6 (1982), 988–1007.

[M2] ______, *A new class of symmetric functions* , Publ.I.R.M.A., Strasbourg, Actes 20-e Seminaire Lotharingen, (1988), 131–171 .

[M3] ______, *Orthogonal polynomials associated with root systems*, Preprint (1988).

[M4] ______, *Affine Hecke algebras and orthogonal polynomials*, Séminaire Bourbaki 47:797 (1995), 01–18.

[M5] ______, *A formal identity for affine root systems*, Preprint (1996).

[M6] ______, *Affine root systems and Dedekind's $\eta$-function*, Inventiones Math. 15 (1972), 91–143.

[Ma] H. Matsumoto, *Analyse harmonique dans les systemes de Tits bornologiques de type affine*, Lecture Notes in Math. 590 (1977).

[Na] M. Nazarov, *Young's symmetrizers for projective representations of the symmetric group*, Adv. Math. 127 (1997), 190–257.

[O1] E.M. Opdam, *Some applications of hypergeometric shift operators*, Invent.Math. 98 (1989), 1–18.

[O2] ______, *Harmonic analysis for certain representations of graded Hecke algebras*, Acta Math. 175 (1995), 75–121.

[O3] ______, *Dunkl operators, Bessel functions and the discriminant of a finite Coxeter group*, Composito Mathematica 85 (1993), 333–373.

[O4] ______, *A generating function for the trace of the Iwahori – Hecke algebra*, math. RT/0101006 (2001).

[O5] ______, *On the spectral decomposition of affine Hecke algebras*, math. RT/0101007 (2001).

[St] J.V. Stokman, *Difference Fourier transforms for nonreduced root systems.* math. CA/0105093 (2002).

[Va] E. Vasserot, *Induced and simple modules of double affine Hecke algebras.* Preprint (2002).

[Ve] E. Verlinde, *Fusion rules and modular transformations in 2D conformal field theory*, Nucl. Phys. B 300(FS22) (1987), 360–376.

(I. Cherednik) Department of Mathematics, UNC Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599, USA, chered@math.unc.edu